

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS



Regulations Regarding Theses and Dissertations

[illegible]

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

A SURVEY OF TEACHER PLACEMENT PRACTICES
IN COUNTY AND DIVISIONAL SCHOOLS IN ALBERTA

by



ALLAN SCHINDELER

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

OCTOBER, 1967

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled "A Survey of Teacher Placement Practices in County and Divisional Schools in Alberta" submitted by Allan Schindeler in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Education.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY
1200 SOUTH DIVISION STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60607-7070
TEL: (773) 835-3100
FAX: (773) 835-3101
WWW: WWW.CHEM.UCHICAGO.EDU

ABSTRACT

This study examines four factors in teacher placement practices both in subject-areas and at grade-levels. The academic and professional preparation of teachers is designed to qualify teachers for certification by the Department of Education. This certification provides broad guidelines for grade-level placement. Guidelines for subject-area placements are found in the patterns of courses followed by teachers while preparing for certification. These two--certification and patterns of academic preparation--constitute the first factor considered in teacher placement.

The second factor used in determining grade-level and subject-area placements is previous teaching experience. Teachers acquire a certain *know-how*, in subject-areas for which they were not initially prepared, by experience in teaching the subject. Similarly, teachers frequently teach at grade-levels other than those for which they received their basic preparation.

Curriculum requirements demand that some courses be offered in Alberta schools. A need for teachers in these courses is thereby created, and this need constitutes a third factor that impinges on placement decisions.

Teachers have or develop a preference for both subject-area and grade-level placements. This preference is the fourth placement factor considered in this study.

To determine the extent to which each of the four factors is used in grade-level and subject-area placements, information was

obtained by means of a questionnaire completed by 627 teachers in large, average and small sized schools of five different types in four geographical areas, each area containing a similar number of school divisions and counties. This number of questionnaires represented a seventy-one per cent return.

The use of the factors of training, experience and needs of the school in subject-area placements compare at sixty-one, twenty-four, and fourteen per cent respectively. Seventeen per cent of the teachers were inappropriately placed on a training basis. Thirteen per cent of the elementary teachers were trained for secondary grades, and sixteen per cent of the secondary teachers were trained for elementary grades. Twenty-nine per cent of the teachers in the survey group would have preferred different subject-area and sixteen per cent different grade-level placements. When the preference levels are established for subject-area placements according to training, experience, and needs of the school, seventy-six per cent of the teachers placed on a training express a high preference for and five per cent dislike their assignments. When placed on an experience basis, only forty-eight per cent of the teachers indicate a high preference for and seven per cent dislike the assignment. Placements by needs of the school rate a sixteen per cent high preference, and an eighteen per cent dislike of the assignment.

The recommendations advanced for correcting the major problems in teacher placement practices revolve around determining the nature of sound placement practices and using the concepts and principles of

placement that are most functional. Methods for the effective use of teacher personnel and revision of the bases for certification need to be investigated.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to the teachers who contributed information for this thesis. The constructive suggestions and advice of his advisor, Dr. F. Enns, and committee member, Dr. C. S. Bumbarger, provided encouragement for the writer to complete the study.

The writer also wishes to thank his wife, Doris, for her patience and understanding throughout the progress of the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY, COLLECTION OF DATA, AND EXPLANATION	
OF TERMS USED.....	1
Introduction.....	1
The Need for the Survey.....	2
The Major Problem.....	3
The Minor Problems.....	3
Assumptions and Limitations of the Study.....	4
An Explanation of Important Terms.....	5
Collection of the Data.....	8
Selection of the Teachers in the Survey Geographical Areas.....	8
Treatment of the Data.....	10
Abbreviations.....	12
II. REVIEW OF RELATED STUDIES.....	14
Introduction.....	14
Appropriate Placement and Subject-Area Training.....	15
Appropriate Placement and Accreditation.....	16
Appropriate Placement and Achievement.....	17
Appropriate Placement and Teacher Attitudes.....	19
Appropriate Placement and the Beginning Teacher.....	19
Appropriate Placement in Smaller Schools.....	20
Appropriate Placement and Professional Responsibility...	21
The Incidence of Inappropriate Placement.....	22

CHAPTER	PAGE
Enforcing Appropriate Placement.....	23
A Concluding Statement.....	23
III. THE TRAINING OF TEACHERS AS A FACTOR IN PLACEMENT.....	25
Purpose of the Chapter.....	25
Treatment of the Data.....	25
Subject-Area Placements by Teacher Training.....	25
Grade-Level Placements and Training Routes.....	26
Grade-Level Placements and Teacher Certification.....	31
Teacher Preparation and Grade-Level Placements.....	31
Preference for Subject-Area Placements.....	33
Summary of Chapter III.....	38
IV. TEACHING EXPERIENCE AS A FACTOR IN PLACEMENT.....	39
Purpose of the Chapter.....	39
Treatment of the Data.....	39
Subject-Area Placements by Experience.....	39
Grade-Level Placements by Experience.....	41
Experience-Based Placements and Preference.....	47
Summary of Chapter IV.....	49
V. PLACEMENT PRACTICES ACCORDING TO THE NEEDS OF THE SCHOOL, FACTOR COMPARISONS, AND TOTAL PLACEMENT SATISFACTION.....	50
Purpose of the Chapter.....	50
Treatment of the Data.....	50
Subject-Area Placements by Needs of the School.....	51
A Comparison of Total Subject-Area Placements by Training, Experience, and Needs of the School.....	51

CHAPTER

PAGE

Preference for Subject-Area Placement by Training, Experience, and the Needs of the School Compared.....	56
Total Teacher Placement Satisfaction.....	59
Summary of Chapter V.....	59
VI. TEACHER PREFERENCE AS A FACTOR IN TEACHER PLACEMENT.....	63
Purpose of the Chapter.....	63
Preference in Grade-Level placement.....	63
Certification and non-preferred grade-level placement.	64
Years of teacher preparation and non-preferred grade- level placement.....	69
Length of service and training routes as factors in non-preferred grade-level placement.....	74
Preference in Subject-Area Placements.....	78
Certification and non-preferred subject-area placements	78
Years of teacher training and non-preferred subject- area placements.....	83
Years of service in a school and non-preferred subject- area placements.....	89
Teacher training routes and non-preferred subject-area placements.....	89
Combined Grade-Level and Subject-Area Non-Preferred Placements.....	92
Summary of Chapter VI.....	92

CHAPTER	PAGE
VII. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	96
Introduction.....	96
The Teacher Preparation Factor.....	96
Teacher training and grade-level placements.....	96
Teacher training and subject-area placements.....	97
Summary of the teacher training factor.....	97
The Experience Factor.....	98
Teacher experience and grade-level placements.....	98
Teacher experience and subject-area placements.....	99
Summary of the teaching experience factor.....	99
The Needs of the School Factor.....	100
Needs of the school and subject-area placements.....	100
Summary of the needs of the school factor.....	100
General Placement Satisfaction Summary.....	101
The Preference Factor.....	101
Teacher preference in grade-level placements.....	101
Teacher preference in subject-area placements.....	103
Summary of the teacher preference factor.....	104
Recommendations.....	105
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	107
APPENDICES	
A. Teacher Placement Questionnaire.....	111
B. Letter to Principals.....	121
C. Letter to Teachers.....	123

APPENDICES (continued)

PAGE

D. Follow-up Letter to Principals..... 125

E. Abbreviations..... 127

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. The Distribution and Return of Questionnaires by Geographical Areas.....	11
II. The Distribution and Return of Questionnaires by Type of School.....	12
III. The Distribution and Return of Questionnaires by Size of Schools.....	13
IV. Classification of Teachers According to Their Major and Minor Fields of Training in Four Geographical Areas.....	27
V. Classification of Teachers According to Their Major and Minor Fields of Training in Five Types of Schools.....	28
VI. Classification of Teachers According to Their Major and Minor Fields of Training In Three Sizes of Schools.....	29
VII. Grade-Level Placements and Training Routes.....	30
VIII. Grade-Level Placement and Teacher Certification.....	32
IX. Training As a Factor in Grade-Level Placement for Four Geographical Areas.....	34
X. Training As a Factor in Grade-Level Placement for Five Types of Schools.....	35
XI. Training As a Factor in Grade-Level Placement for Three Sizes of Schools.....	36
XII. Preference For Subject-Area Placements Made According to the Training of the Teachers.....	37
XIII. Subject-Area Placements According to Experience For Four Geographical Areas.....	40

TABLE

PAGE

XIV.	Subject-Area Placements According to Experience For Five Types of Schools.....	42
XV.	Subject-Area Placements According to Experience For Three Sizes of Schools.....	43
XVI.	Teaching Experience As a Factor in Grade-Level Placements In Four Geographical Areas.....	44
XVII.	Teaching Experience As a Factor in Grade-Level Placement In Five Types of Schools.....	45
XVIII.	Teaching Experience As a Factor in Grade-Level Placement In Three Sizes of Schools.....	46
XIX.	Placement By Experience Related To Preference for a Subject-Area For the Survey Area.....	48
XX.	Subject-Area Placements By Needs of the School In Four Geographical Areas.....	52
XXI.	Subject-Area Placements By Needs of the School In Five Types of Schools.....	53
XXII.	Subject-Area Placements By Needs of the School For Three Sizes of Schools.....	54
XXIII.	A Comparison of Total Subject-Area Placements by Training, Experience and Needs of the School.....	55
XXIV.	Teacher Preference For Subject-Area Placements According To the Needs of the School.....	57
XXV.	A Comparison of Preference for Subject-Area Placements by Training, Experience and Needs of the School.....	58

TABLE

PAGE

XXVI.	Total Teaching Placement Satisfaction In Four Geographical Areas.....	60
XXVII.	Total Teaching Assignment Satisfaction For Four Grade Divisions.....	61
XXVIII.	Non-Preferred Grade-Level Placements In Four Geographical Areas.....	63
XXIX.	Non-Preferred Grade-Level Placements In Five Types of Schools.....	65
XXX.	Non-Preferred Grade-Level Placements In Three Sizes of Schools.....	66
XXXI.	A Comparison Between Classes of Teaching Certificates And Non-Preferred Grade-Level Placements in Four Geographical Areas.....	67
XXXII.	A Comparison Between Classes of Teaching Certificates and Non-Preferred Grade-Level Placements in Five Types of Schools.....	68
XXXIII.	A Comparison Between Classes of Teaching Certificates and Non-Preferred Grade-Level Placements in Three Sizes of Schools.....	70
XXXIV.	A Comparison Between Years of Teacher Training and Non-Preferred Grade-Level Placements in Four Geographical Areas.....	71
XXXV.	A Comparison Between Years of Teacher Training and Non-Preferred Grade-Level Placements in Five Types of Schools	72

TABLE	PAGE
XXXVI. A Comparison Between Years of Teacher Training and Non-Preferred Grade-Level Placements in Three Sizes of Schools.....	73
XXXVII. The Distribution of Teachers Holding Recognized University Degrees, Misplaced by Preference for Grade-Levels By Geographical Areas, Types and Sizes of Schools.....	75
XXXVIII. The Relationship Between Non-Preferred Grade-Level Placement and Length of Service in a School.....	76
XXXIX. The Relationship Between Non-Preferred Grade-Level Placement and Teacher Training Routes.....	77
XL. Non-Preferred Subject-Area Placements In Four Geographical Areas.....	79
XLI. Non-Preferred Subject-Area Placements In Five Types of Schools.....	80
XLII. Non-Preferred Subject-Area Placements In Three Sizes of Schools.....	81
XLIII. A Comparison Between Classes of Teaching Certificates and Non-Preferred Subject-Area Placements in Four Geographical Areas.....	82
XLIV. A Comparison Between Classes of Teaching Certificates and Non-Preferred Subject-Area Placements in Five Types of Schools.....	84
XLV. A Comparison Between Classes of Teaching Certificates and Non-Preferred Subject-Area Placements in Three Sizes of Schools.....	85

TABLE

PAGE

XLVI.	A Comparison Between Years of Teacher Training and Non-Preferred Subject-Area Placements in Four Geographical Areas.....	86
XLVII.	A Comparison Between Years of Teacher Training and Non-Preferred Subject-Area Placements in Five Types of Schools.....	87
XLVIII.	A Comparison Between Years of Teacher Training and Non-Preferred Subject-Area Placements in Three Sizes of Schools.....	88
XLIX.	The Relationship Between Non-Preferred Subject-Area Placement and Length of Service in a School.....	90
L.	The Relationship Between Non-Preferred Subject-Area Placements and Teacher Training Routes.....	91
LI.	Combined Dual Misplacements for the Survey Area.....	93
LII.	A Summary of Combined Misplacements By Preference for Grade-Levels and Subject-Areas for the Survey Area.....	94

CHAPTER I

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY, COLLECTION OF DATA AND EXPLANATION OF TERMS USED

Introduction

School administrators are faced with many problems one of which is the appropriate placement of teachers both at grade-levels and in subject-areas. There is some evidence that a number of teachers in Alberta schools are placed inappropriately. Teachers trained for elementary grade-level placements are teaching in grades at the secondary level. Teachers trained for secondary teaching positions are placed at elementary grade-levels. Some teachers have received a Letter of Authority from the Provincial Government's Department of Education permitting them to teach at grade-levels beyond those normally permitted by the certificates they possess. Some teachers are teaching subject matter in which they have no training and, in some cases, no experience in the subject field nor preference for the task.

Teacher placement practices have implications for teacher efficiency and effectiveness as well as teacher morale and satisfaction. It is recognized that schools cannot be operated without teachers regardless of their type of training, previous teaching experiences, or grade-level and subject-area preferences. It is recognized also that a shortage of teachers both in grade-level and subject-area categories may have an effect on placement practices. This survey attempts to describe the nature of the placement practices used, to determine

the incidence of inappropriate placement as herein defined, and to find some of the reasons for the placement practices used in the schools included in the survey.

The Need for the Survey

Very few studies have been undertaken in Alberta with respect to teacher placement practices. One exploratory project carried out by Worth¹ identified misassignment (inappropriate grade-level placement) as a problem in Alberta education. One comprehensive report by MacArthur and Lindstedt² undertook to determine the academic background of the teaching force in Alberta and to ascertain the subject-area training of teachers of the subjects in the high school grades. This report clearly pointed to an undesirable subject-area placement situation in Alberta schools.

More information is available concerning placement practices in the United States. The practices in parts of that country are far from satisfactory and led Conant to the opinion that educational institutions should award a teaching certificate for teachers in grades seven to twelve in one field only.³ Conant also recommended that educational authorities should give top priority to the development of

¹Walter H. Worth, "What Happens to Newly Certified Teachers?" *The Alberta School Trustee*, Vol. 35, No. 5, (December, 1965), pp. 8 - 9.

²R. S. MacArthur and Sidney A. Lindstedt, "The Alberta Teacher Force in 1957-58," *Alberta Advisory Committee on Educational Research*, Monograph in Education No. 3 (Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1960).

³James B. Conant, *The Education of American Teachers* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963), p. 167.

regulations insuring that a teacher will be assigned only to those teaching duties for which he is specifically prepared, and should enforce these regulations vigorously.⁴

In the light of Worth's survey,⁵ the MacArthur and Lindstedt report,⁶ and the point of view that a teacher is most effective in teaching at grade-levels and in subject-areas for which he is trained, there is a need to ascertain whether the problem of appropriate placement is being accommodated adequately in Alberta schools.

The Major Problem

It could be true that some schools and even some school systems in Alberta have, by judicious planning, developed sound placement practices. There is no evidence that this has happened. The incidence of appropriate placement of Alberta teachers has never been established clearly. This survey endeavored to answer the question: To what extent are teachers placed in subject-areas and at grade-levels for which they have received academic and professional preparation?

The Minor Problems

School administrators responsible for staffing schools require the presentation of some formal documents from prospective staff members and no doubt are in possession of this type of information for teachers

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 67.

⁵Worth, *op. cit.*

⁶MacArthur, *op. cit.*

who are already in the school system. These documents may include a teaching certificate from the Alberta Department of Education. Transcripts of a teacher's education may be required. A statement of teaching experience may be taken. A staff member may request a grade-level or subject-area transfer.

The assessment of these records, statements, and requests for the placement of a teacher is important and gives rise to several questions for which this survey attempted to provide answers.

1. Are elementary and secondary routes of training used as a factor in placement practices?
2. Is the subject-area preparation of a teacher used as a factor in placement practices?
3. Is the previous teaching experience of a teacher used as a factor in placement practices?
4. Are the needs of the school used as a factor in placement practices?
5. Is the personal preference of a teacher as to subject-area and grade-level used as a factor in placement practices?

Assumptions and Limitations of the Study

School systems may use many factors in the selection and appointment of teachers. Some of these factors may be justified by local circumstances. The factors investigated in this survey are those that might be most commonly used by all school systems. To this extent this survey is limited to the records of preparation of teachers in teacher-training institutions, the teaching experience of teachers, and the preference of teachers for grade-level and subject-area placements.

The factor of the comparability of teacher training is not considered. It is not a purpose of this survey to question the effectiveness of teachers in either grade-level or subject-area placements. The same is true of the relative merits of different kinds or types of teaching experience. The problem of inappropriate preference is not considered in this survey. A teacher may prefer a subject-area or grade-level placement not in keeping with the teacher's preparation.

This survey deals only with a geographically representative sample of teachers in the publicly supported schools in Alberta Counties and School Divisions in 1966. The problems of urban district school systems are assumed to be different from those of rural Alberta and these systems may be developing policies on teacher placement that would not be suitable nor practical in Counties and School Divisions.

An Explanation of Important Terms

Several terms are used throughout this report which are described in this section. Some explanations are necessary in order to provide a common base to accommodate data submitted by teachers who have received their teacher training under a variety of regulations in a large number of teacher training institutions.

Appropriate placement. This term means a grade-level or subject-area placement for which the teacher's academic and professional preparation are deemed suitable, the teacher's past experiences are appropriate, and the placement is in keeping with the teacher's preference.

Inappropriate placement. This term is used to describe a situation where any of the factors of appropriate placement are violated and includes placements made on the basis of needs of the school.

A teaching major or major field of study. The requirements for a major in the Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, have changed recently and now consist of a prescribed core of four or five content courses supported by three or two content courses within the field of study or in related fields for the secondary route. Each teacher following the elementary route must select a major which consists of four prescribed courses.⁷ The earlier regulations consisted of four or five prescribed courses for a major in the secondary training route. A certain pattern of five courses provides for an elementary major.⁸

The requirements of the Faculty of Education at the University of Calgary were not included in this study. It is assumed that the regulations do not differ to an extent which would change the generalities of this study.

A teaching minor or minor field of study. Under the same regulations noted for majors, there are no longer minor fields of study as such. However, the full program allows a selection of some courses to explore a variety of fields, or they may be patterned to provide some preparation for certain functions related to teaching in the secondary

⁷Faculty of Education, *Calendar* (Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1965-66), pp. 49 - 56.

⁸Faculty of Education, *Calendar* (Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1960-61), pp. 53 - 60.

school. The earlier regulations for a minor are described because many of the teachers contributing to this survey will have been trained under this plan. Three or two approved content courses in a field or related fields were required.

Certification. All certificates that have ever been issued by the Alberta Department of Education can be rated under new regulations.⁹

<u>Certificate</u>	<u>Valid in Grades</u>
Interim Junior E	1 to 9
Junior E	1 to 9
Standard E	1 to 9
Standard S	4 to 11
Professional	1 to 12

The Interim Junior E was issued to teachers trained in Alberta or under other jurisdictions prior to September 1, 1962, provided their academic and professional qualifications were acceptable to the Minister of Education. This certificate could be made permanent when the teacher had obtained matriculation to the Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, or had completed university courses in lieu of matriculation deficiencies.

Only the Standard E, Standard S, and Professional Certificates are issued to teachers in Alberta effective September 1, 1966.

Subject categories. Common groupings of major and minor areas of subject matter specialization are used in several tables in this study. This is necessary because there were as few as two cases of

⁹Government of the Province of Alberta, *Regulations Governing Certification of Teachers* (Edmonton: Department of Education, 1966).

specialization in a subject-area. Another stems from the fact that many teachers in the survey area were trained in normal schools and other preparatory institutions more as generalists than as specialists with respect to teaching fields. The subject categories used are shown along with convenient abbreviations in Appendix E.

Collection of the Data

The data for this survey were collected by means of a questionnaire developed by the investigator.¹⁰ A draft form of the questionnaire was submitted to three groups of teachers--an elementary school staff, a junior high school staff, and a senior high school staff--for their criticisms and suggestions. The revised questionnaire was distributed in selected schools for completion by the teachers of these schools.

Selection of the Teachers in the Survey Geographical Areas

To obtain a sample of teachers which was geographically representative, teachers were selected from schools in four areas of Alberta. The province was divided into four geographical areas established by drawing east-west lines through Drumheller and Wetaskiwin and a north-south line from Wetaskiwin to the northern boundary of Alberta. The four areas are referred to as:

1. The Northwest Area
2. The Northeast Area
3. The Central Area
4. The South Area

¹⁰See Appendix A, p. 111.

Types of schools. Within each geographical area, teachers were selected from each of five types of schools. These five types were as follows:

1. Elementary Schools
2. Elementary - Junior High Schools
3. Elementary - Junior High - Senior High Schools
4. Junior - Senior High Schools
5. Senior High Schools

Sizes of schools. Within each of the types of schools, teachers were selected from schools of various sizes. These sizes were as follows:

1. Among the smallest in the province
2. An average size
3. The largest in the province

Characteristics of the survey sample. Eight hundred eighty questionnaires were distributed. A return of seventy-five per cent was expected. No attempt at a random sample of the teachers of Alberta was made. The method used to obtain a reasonable number of teachers in the survey is such that a representative distribution for the less-urbanized areas of the province was secured.

Distribution and return of the questionnaires. Mailing lists were compiled from the List of Operating Schools in Alberta, 1965-66, of the Department of Education, compiled on December 9, 1965. The questionnaires for each school, accompanied by a letter of explanation for the principal¹¹ soliciting his cooperation in the questionnaire distribution, and letters for each teacher¹² explaining the purpose of the questionnaire, were mailed on May 23, 1966. Self-addressed envelopes

¹¹See appendix B, p. 121.

¹²See appendix C, p. 123.

were provided for the return of the questionnaires. A follow-up letter¹³ was mailed to the principals on June 16, 1966, as a reminder that the end of the year was approaching rapidly. The last questionnaire was received on August 20, 1966.

Table I is a summary of the questionnaire distribution and return. Of the eight hundred eighty questionnaires distributed, six hundred twenty-seven or seventy-one per cent were returned. Tables II and III show the distribution and return of questionnaires by types and sizes of schools.

Treatment of the Data

The information recorded on the questionnaires was tabulated in many ways. A basis for comparison of the factors in teacher placement was obtained by converting frequency counts to percentages. The data breakdown for each factor being studied is recorded in the form of a table. Each table forms a part of a description of the importance of the factor or factors in teacher placement.

Abbreviations

For convenience in tabulating the data from the questionnaires it was found useful to devise a system of abbreviations. In most cases these abbreviations are self explanatory. A table of the abbreviations used in this study is found in Appendix E at the end of the study.

¹³ See Appendix D, p. 125.

TABLE I
THE DISTRIBUTION AND RETURN OF QUESTIONNAIRES
BY GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS

Geographical Area	Number Distributed	Number Returned	Per Cent Returned
Northwest	206	146	71
Northeast	227	170	75
Central	231	152	66
South	216	159	74
Totals	880	627	71

TABLE II
THE DISTRIBUTION AND RETURN OF QUESTIONNAIRES
BY TYPE OF SCHOOL

Type of School	Number Distributed	Number Returned	Per Cent Returned
E	180	129	72
E-JH	129	97	75
E-JH-SH	177	127	72
JH-SH	195	128	66
SH	199	146	73
Totals	880	627	71

TABLE III

THE DISTRIBUTION AND RETURN OF QUESTIONNAIRES
BY SIZE OF SCHOOLS

Size of School	Number Distributed	Number Returned	Per Cent Returned
L	425	318	74
A	273	183	68
S	182	126	70
Totals	880	627	71

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED STUDIES

Introduction

Alberta teachers are drawn from sources both within and outside the province. Teachers are prepared for teaching assignments by the Faculties of the University of Alberta in Edmonton and the University of Calgary. These Faculties are organized for the professional education of teachers for elementary, junior high and senior high school grades.¹ Some Alberta teachers received their preparation for teaching in universities and colleges in other provinces and countries. Up to and during the time the data for this study were collected, the University of Alberta was responsible for recommending the certification of teachers by the Minister of Education regardless of the institution in which teachers were prepared.

Practicing teachers in Alberta can expect to receive an appraisal of their performance as a teacher from a provincially or locally appointed superintendent of schools. A report of the inspection for this appraisal includes an assessment of the preparation (academic and professional) and knowledge of subject matter of teachers.²

The professional organization of Alberta teachers exercises guidance for its members in the matter of assignment. The Alberta

¹Faculty of Education, *Calendar* (Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1965-66), p. 40.

²Government of the Province of Alberta, *Report of Superintendent of Schools*, Form 313-6c (Edmonton: Department of Education, 1966).

Teachers' Association "Standards of Professional Conduct" states in part, "The teacher does not accept without protest assignment of duties . . . which make it difficult or impossible to render professional service."³

The preparation of teachers, the expectations of superintendents, and the professional conduct of teachers all point to assignments to teaching positions with certain definite limitations. This may not be the case in Alberta schools. Worth, in one investigation of this problem wrote, ". . . one gets the impression that most Alberta school systems have only 'misplacement' policies and procedures."⁴

The National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards carried out a comprehensive study in 1965 on assignment and misassignment of American teachers.⁵ One question in the survey was, "Is misassignment a major problem in the public schools?" Of the 1,035 educators who responded to the questionnaire, 677 described one or more cases of misassignment. Many other writers have also alluded to and have made definite recommendations for alleviating the problem.

Appropriate Placement and Subject-Area Training

Conant outlined the qualifications he believed teachers of the junior high school should have. In this discussion he made this point:

³Alberta Teachers' Association, "Standards of Professional Conduct," *Alberta Teachers' Association Handbook* (Edmonton: Alberta Teachers' Association, 1965), p. 25.

⁴Walter H. Worth, "What Happens to Newly Certified Teachers?" *The Alberta School Trustee*, Vol. 35, No. 5, (December, 1965), p. 9.

⁵National Education Association, National Commission of STEPS, "The Assignment and Misassignment of American Teachers," *Report of the Special Committee*, (Washington, D.C.: The Commission, 1965), p. 6.

these grades should be progressively more departmentalized--pupils should have specialist teachers.⁶

Smith discussed the type of training the teacher should have:

The prospective teacher should find in his major two things: a command in depth of his subject and a link between his liberal education and his purely professional work. The mastery of the subject well beyond the limits that can be expected of better students in the class is an essential minimum, for he should be expected to have reserves of learning that outreach anything that is to be directly demanded of him in his classroom.⁷

Conant's opinion was very much the same:

Only through pursuing a subject well beyond the introductory level can the student gain a coherent picture of the subject, get a glimpse of the vast reaches of knowledge, feel the cutting edge of disciplined training and discover the satisfaction of the scholarly habit of mind (so that if he becomes a teacher, he can communicate something of this spirit to others.)⁸

Goetting supports this point of view and states that academic preparation is basic to any consideration of qualifications and there is no substitute for it. He goes further by stating that teachers need to be familiar with the techniques and methods of teaching which are appropriate to their subject and grade to ensure teaching effectiveness.⁹

Appropriate Placement and Accreditation

One point considered in the proposals for accreditation of schools is that of the academic and professional preparation of the teaching

⁶James B. Conant, *Recommendations for Education in the Junior High Years, A Recommendation to School Boards* (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Services, 1960), p. 13.

⁷Elmer R. Smith, *Teaching Education: A Reappraisal* (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), pp. 51 - 63.

⁸James B. Conant, *The Education of American Teachers* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963), p. 106.

⁹Martin L. Goetting, *Teaching in the Secondary School* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1954), pp. 40 - 41.

staff. The Alberta Teachers' Association noted that in accredited schools of Manitoba a teacher must have at least two years' university credit or its equivalent and two years' successful teaching experience in the subject he is teaching.¹⁰

Appropriate Placement and Achievement

Chorny noted the quality of the teaching staff as a major strength of a superior English program.¹¹ Clarke reported that a combination of smaller classes and better qualified teachers resulted in higher marks for students on the grade nine final examination.¹² Marshall was concerned about the qualifications of teachers of foreign languages--well trained in the language field as well as in the teaching of children. "We feel that *no* teaching is better than inadequate teaching."¹³

The Tetley and Jenkinson report also had implications for achievement:

One of the most important functions of high ranking educational administrators is the selection and placement of teachers in such a way as to provide the best possible results, in terms of achievement, among the pupils of their individual school systems. Long

¹⁰The Alberta Teachers' Association, Problems in Education Series, No. 3, *Accreditation* (Edmonton: The Alberta Teachers' Association, November, 1960), p. 13

¹¹M. Chorny (ed.), *English Memos*, Vol. 1, No. 2, (Edmonton: English Council of the Alberta Teachers' Association, March, 1966), p. 1.

¹²Stanley C. T. Clarke and Sandra Richel, "The Effect of Class Size and Teacher Qualifications on Achievement," *The Alberta Teachers' Association Research Monograph No. 5* (Edmonton: The Alberta Teachers' Association, April, 1963), p. 71.

¹³M. Marshall et al, "Beware the Foreign Language Bandwagon," *Elementary School Journal*, Vol. LXI, (December, 1960), pp. 133 - 136.

years of experience (taken alone) appear to offer no assurance of inducing high pupil achievement in reading.¹⁴

Rancier related assignment to drop-out problems and suggested that dislike of school and teachers might often be traced to courses the teachers have to offer, some of which might be out of the teacher's area of specialization, or in an area where the student has little interest.¹⁵

Eddy found there was a significant relationship between social studies marks scored by the pupils and the number of years of academic and professional training of the teachers of the subject. The number of courses at the university level, the number of years of experience in teaching the subject, and also preference for teaching the subject by the teacher had a relationship to the marks obtained by the pupils.¹⁶

Similarly, Lindstedt reported that teachers with four or more years of training are more competent than teachers with less training, as measured by the marks received by their students on the grade nine mathematics examination of the Department of Education. Those teachers who indicated that the mathematics-science field was their first teaching

¹⁴Dorothy F. Tetley and M. D. Jenkinson, "Teacher Characteristics and Teacher Qualifications," *The Canadian Administrator*, Vol. IV, No. 1, (Edmonton: The University of Alberta, October, 1964).

¹⁵G. J. Rancier, "Case Studies of High School Drop Outs," *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. IX, No. 1, (Edmonton: The University of Alberta, March, 1963), p. 20.

¹⁶Wesley P. Eddy, "Teacher Characteristics and Grade IX Social Studies Achievement," *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. IX, No. 4, (Edmonton: The University of Alberta, December, 1963), pp. 261 - 62.

preference had pupils with higher average standings in the final mathematics examination than did teachers who did not have this preference.¹⁷

Appropriate Placement and Teacher Attitudes

The relationship or importance of effective administration to teacher satisfaction cannot be discounted. There are many factors that influence the attitudes of teachers. Chase carried out an investigation of satisfaction in teaching and concluded that the satisfaction of a teacher is closely related to a feeling that he is assigned to work for which he is well qualified. He was of the opinion that the task must make demands on his abilities and interests but must not be such that he has little hope of performing efficiently.¹⁸

Allen expresses the same idea this way:

The teacher's assignment in the school clearly relates directly to his capacity to achieve excellence in teaching. There are few matters related to school personnel practices which, justifiably or not, draw as much unfavorable comment from teachers and others as do assignment practices. In the school there is the damaging habit of assuming that the general competence of the "competent" teacher can be used with good educational effect in many, if not most, situations.¹⁹

Appropriate Placement and the Beginning Teacher

There is little systematic research on the placement of teachers once employed. The problem of the placement of beginning teachers seems

¹⁷Sidney A. Lindstedt, "Teacher Qualifications and Grade IX Mathematics Achievement," *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. VI, No. 2 (Edmonton: The University of Alberta, June, 1960), pp. 83 - 84.

¹⁸Francis S. Chase, "Factors Productive of Satisfaction in Teaching," (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, June, 1952), Leaf 230.

¹⁹Wendell C. Allen, "Assignment and Its Relationship to Teaching Expertness," *Journal of Secondary Education*, Vol. 37 (December, 1962), pp. 473 - 77.

to have been looked at more carefully. Elsbree cited the problem of the non-specific assignment of teachers in large school systems at the time of employment, including having no consideration for the interests and wishes of the teacher, large classes, discipline problem areas, and a heavy work load.²⁰

Appropriate Placement in Smaller Schools

The smaller the school the more difficult the problems of securing and assigning teachers become. Romine identified one of the major problems as that of necessarily assigning a teacher to two or more teaching fields. This practice creates a chain of problems such as higher staff turnover and the difficulty of finding replacements for subject combinations. The major problem is frequently solved by filling subject-area vacancies with experienced but unqualified teachers.²¹

Fielstra suggests that prospective teachers for smaller schools should gain competence in more than one subject field and should relate minor and majors areas of preparation to the more usual combinations of subject-fields.²² In such schools it is almost impossible to secure the personnel for other complementary professional services. Impressed or converted teachers should be well informed about the possibilities

²⁰Willard B. Elsbree, *Staff Personnel in the Public School* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1954), pp. 94 - 96.

²¹Stephen Romine, "Teaching Assignments and Instructional Loads in Secondary Schools," *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, Vol. 42, (November, 1958), pp. 55 - 63.

²²Clarence Fielstra, "Subject Matter Assignments of Teachers in Smaller High Schools," *California Journal of Secondary Education*, Vol. 34, (November, 1959), pp. 420 - 25.

of continuing in their new fields so that they may take steps to improve their qualifications.

McAulay, in discussing the problem of subject area teacher shortages, observed that frequently teachers of these subjects have them as second or third choice areas. These teachers are insecure in such assignments. They must exert extra energy and time to prepare lessons in subjects where their background is weak. The frustration thus generated is quickly passed on to their classes.²³

Appropriate Placement and Professional Responsibility

A particular occupation merits the designation of "profession" when, among several conditions, a high degree of skill, knowledge, wisdom--trained intelligence--is required in the performance of the duties of the occupation. In this lies the greatest opportunity for accepting professional responsibility to move education forward. While we maintain that teaching requires a high degree of education and skill, we often contradict this in both organization and the conduct of schools.²⁴

It must be a professional obligation of administrators to devise methods to overcome the inadequacies in staff qualifications as far as the limitations of proven techniques and personal knowledge will permit.

²³J. D. McAulay, "Training and Retraining of Mathematics and Science Teachers," *Science Education*, Vol. XLIX (March, 1965), pp. 162 - 164.

²⁴Robert N. Bush, "Responsibility for Professional Performance," National Education Association, National Commission on TEPS, *The Education of Teachers: Certification*, Report of the San Diego Conference (Washington, D.C.: The Commission, 1960), pp. 271 - 76.

The Incidence of Inappropriate Placement

Eddy reported that 58.2 per cent of the teachers covered in the survey he made had a teaching preference in some subject-field other than English-social studies, yet teachers appear to do the most effective job in the subject-area in which they prefer to teach.²⁵

A similar situation was reported by Worth:

So few Standard S certificate holders are given teaching assignments related to their preparation programs that one gets the impression that most Alberta School Systems have only "misplacement" policies and procedures. As a consequence, it may be concluded that many students are being taught by "unqualified" teachers and that the integrity of the entire teaching profession is being seriously undermined.²⁶

MacArthur and Lindstedt observed that there were teachers in all subjects in all grades from seven to twelve that had no training in the fields they were teaching. In no subject at the grade twelve level were there as many as fifty per cent adequately trained.²⁷

Mitzel and Dick place misassignment as the fifth most important problem in education.²⁸ Schultz found that a group of least satisfied teachers in his survey had frequently been assigned to duties which they were not qualified to perform and which did not utilize their professional capabilities.²⁹

²⁵Eddy, *op. cit.*, p. 262.

²⁶Worth, *op. cit.*

²⁷R. S. MacArthur and Sidney A. Lindstedt, "The Alberta Teacher Force in 1957-58," Alberta Advisory Committee on Educational Research, *Monograph in Education*, No. 3 (Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1960).

²⁸Harold E. Mitzel and Walter Dick, "The Relative Importance of Teacher Misassignment as a Problem in Education" *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 16, (March, 1965), pp. 54 - 60.

²⁹Raymond E. Schultz, "Keeping Up Teacher Morale," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 50 (October, 1952), pp. 53 - 56.

Enforcing Appropriate Placement

Conant's observations were previously noted in Chapter I.

Osborn agrees with this point of view but suggests, as an alternative plan for ensuring proper assignment, that a general certificate be issued as an authority to teach in high school which would cover general education, academic concentration and professional education. Approval certificates for subject areas would be issued when preparation reached a stated minimum.³⁰

Bush tried to fix professional responsibility in assignment:

Effective enforcement of proper assignment and other standards depends upon a disciplined profession of local school administrators, accrediting agencies, local school associations, and individual practitioners. None of these should permit a teacher to undertake the teaching of a subject for which he is unprepared.³¹

A Concluding Statement

The Royal Commission on Education included this excerpt:

To educate children who will be prepared to meet and master the demands of today's world and tomorrow's, our schools need professional teachers. Teachers must know what they are doing and why. In addition to general education, they must have mastered their field at an adult level and know how to bring pupils to a mastery of the field at the pupils' level.

Informational background refers to the content of what is to be taught. Competence in background . . . This kind of preparation should comprise the bulk of a teacher's background. A teacher must know more than he is required to teach in order to enrich his pupils' education.³²

³⁰Wayland W. Osborn, "The General Certificate and Enforcement of Teaching Assignments," National Education Association, National Commission on TEPS, *The Education of Teachers: Certification*, Report of the San Diego Conference (Washington, D.C.: The Commission, 1960), pp. 215 - 26.

³¹Bush, *op. cit.*

³²*Report of the Royal Commission on Education* (Edmonton: The Queen's Printer, 1959), p. 186.

The literature dealing with the appropriate placement of teachers clearly illustrates that there is some concern about the problem among educators. There is marked agreement about the many facets of the problem, particularly about the fact that practice has not kept up with the recommendations of the studies that have been undertaken. An assessment of the incidence of inappropriate placement in Alberta schools could lead to changes in the future.

CHAPTER III

THE TRAINING OF TEACHERS AS A FACTOR IN PLACEMENT

I. PURPOSE OF THE CHAPTER

All teachers in the Province of Alberta have received some formal teacher training in a normal school, at the University of Alberta, or at the University of Calgary, or comparable training may have been received at some institution outside the province. This chapter examines the part played by this training in the placement of teachers both in grade-level and subject-area placements.

Specifically, answers are sought for several questions. Is the training a teacher has taken used in placement practices? To what extent is the training factor considered in placement practices? Is placement consistent with major and minor routes of training? Is there a difference in the consideration of training at different grade-levels when placing teachers?

II. TREATMENT OF THE DATA

The data for this chapter are tabulated, each table being accompanied by a brief explanation of its purpose and an outline of significant findings. A summary of important points is found at the end of the chapter.

III. SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS BY TEACHER TRAINING

Eight hundred nineteen subject-area placements, made in the survey area on the basis of the teachers' being trained for such

assignments, were investigated. Table IV shows the number of placements by training for each of the four geographical areas. In all geographical areas, training as a factor in teacher placement plays approximately the same part. In all teaching fields except the "other" and "technical" categories the percentage use of training never varies by more than eight per cent from highest to lowest. In the south geographical area the "other" category is noticeably higher, and the spread is twenty-five per cent from high to low.

In Table V it can be seen that there is never more than a seven per cent difference between the highest and lowest use of training as a subject-area placement factor among the five types of schools except in the case of fine arts and technical teaching categories. In the latter cases, this could be a result of the fact that the fine arts are relatively neglected in schools containing the senior high grades and that technical subjects are not commonly taught in the elementary grades.

The size of the school seems to have no effect on the use of training as a factor in subject-area placement. Table VI illustrates this point. There is never more than a five per cent difference between the highest and lowest use of training in all teaching categories when subject-area placements are examined for different sizes of schools.

IV. GRADE-LEVEL PLACEMENTS AND TRAINING ROUTES

Table VII outlines the teaching grade-levels for teachers in the survey area by their preparation routes. Two points stand out.

TABLE IV
CLASSIFICATION OF TEACHERS ACCORDING TO THEIR
MAJOR AND MINOR FIELDS OF TRAINING
IN FOUR GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS

Area	Placements in Major and Minor Subject Fields on the Basis of Teacher Preparation					Total
	ESS	MSc	FA	Tech	Other	
Northwest	57	46	26	5	42	176
Per Cent	24	22	22	8	22	
Northeast	60	65	36	23	42	226
Per Cent	26	30	30	36	22	
Central	57	52	27	16	29	181
Per Cent	24	24	23	25	15	
South	59	51	29	20	77	236
Per Cent	25	24	25	31	40	
Totals	233	214	118	64	190	819
Per Cent	29	26	14	8	23	

NOTE: Of the 233 teachers placed in the English-social studies teaching category on the basis of being trained for such placement, fifty-seven or twenty-four per cent were found in the north-west area. Other per cents may be similarly interpreted.

TABLE V
CLASSIFICATION OF TEACHERS ACCORDING TO THEIR
MAJOR AND MINOR FIELDS OF TRAINING
IN FIVE TYPES OF SCHOOLS

Type	Placements in Major and Minor Subject Fields on the Basis of Teacher Preparation					Total
	ESS	MSc	FA	Tech	Other	
E	53	45	43	0	43	184
Per Cent	29	25	23	0	23	
E-JH	32	32	30	0	28	122
Per Cent	26	26	25	0	23	
E-JH-SH	57	56	32	8	39	192
Per Cent	30	29	17	4	20	
JH-SH	42	34	7	27	41	151
Per Cent	28	23	5	18	27	
SH	49	47	6	29	39	170
Per Cent	29	28	4	17	23	
Totals	233	214	118	64	190	819
Per Cent	29	26	14	8	23	

NOTE: Of the 184 teachers placed in elementary schools on the basis of being trained for the subject-area, fifty-three or twenty-nine per cent were placed in the English-social studies teaching category. Other figures and per cents may be similarly interpreted.

TABLE VI
CLASSIFICATION OF TEACHERS ACCORDING TO THEIR
MAJOR AND MINOR FIELDS OF TRAINING
IN THREE SIZES OF SCHOOLS

Size	Placements in Major and Minor Subject Fields on the Basis of Teacher Preparation					Total
	ESS	MSc	FA	Tech	Other	
Large	123	106	62	38	107	436
Per Cent	28	24	14	9	25	
Average	67	67	36	16	54	240
Per Cent	28	28	15	7	22	
Small	43	41	20	10	29	143
Per Cent	30	29	14	7	20	
Totals	233	214	118	64	190	819
Per Cent	29	26	14	8	23	

NOTE: Of the 436 teachers placed in large schools on the basis of being trained for the subject-area, 123 or twenty-eight per cent were placed in the English-social studies teaching category. Other figures and per cents may be similarly interpreted.

TABLE VII
GRADE-LEVEL PLACEMENTS AND TRAINING ROUTES

Training Route	School Type	Teaching Division				No Report
		1	2	3	4	
E	E	62	49			0
	E-JH	24	15	11		0
	E-JH-SH	23	22	9	5	0
	JH-SH			21	5	0
	SH				8	0
Totals		109	86	41	18	0
Combined Totals			195		59	
Per Cent			87		16	
S	E	4	13			0
	E-JH	3	6	33		0
	E-JH-SH	2	2	17	40	0
	JH-SH			32	65	0
	SH				135	0
Totals		9	21	82	240	0
Combined Totals			30		322	
Per Cent			13		84	
No Report	E					1
	E-JH					5
	E-JH-SH					5
	JH-SH					7
	SH					3
Totals			225		381	21

In the first instance it is found that nine division one teachers and twenty-one division two teachers for a total of thirty, or thirteen per cent of the 225 elementary school teachers, were trained for secondary grades. The second group of misplacements would be teachers prepared for elementary grades teaching in divisions three and four. Forty-one division three teachers and eighteen division four teachers, a combined group of fifty-nine, or sixteen per cent of the 381 secondary teachers, were trained for elementary grades.

V. GRADE-LEVEL PLACEMENTS AND TEACHER CERTIFICATION

A number of teachers may be misplaced by grade-levels according to the certificates which they possess. Table VIII indicates the grades to which the teachers of the survey area have been assigned. A total of fifty-one out of 627, or eight per cent of the total, may be misplaced.

Two hundred eighty-three, or forty-five per cent of the teachers in the survey area, have professional teaching certificates but only twenty-eight or ten per cent are found in the elementary grades.

The grade range of certificates must be understood to interpret Table VIII correctly.

Junior E	Grades 1 - 9
Standard E	Grades 1 - 9
Standard S	Grades 4 - 11
Professional	Grades 1 - 12

VI. TEACHER PREPARATION AND GRADE-LEVEL PLACEMENTS

Teachers trained on the elementary route are normally certificated to teach in grades one through nine, and teachers trained on the

TABLE VIII

GRADE-LEVEL PLACEMENT AND TEACHER CERTIFICATION

Type	Teaching Division	Certification					Totals
		LA	JrE	E	S	P	
E	1	5	25	25	*5	6	66
	2	1	23	13	14	12	63
E-JH	1	2	14	8	*1	3	28
	2	0	8	6	5	4	23
	3	1	8	3	12	22	46
E-JH-SH	1	2	15	7	0	2	26
	2	3	9	8	4	1	25
	3	0	5	4	7	11	27
	4	2	*2	*1	7	35	47
JH-SH	3	5	9	5	18	17	54
	4	6	*2	*3	13	52	76
SH	4	4	*4	*2	18	118	146
Totals		*31	124	84	105	283	627
Per Cent		5	20	13	27	45	
Probable Misplacements*		31	8	6	6	0	51
Per Cent Misplacement		5	1	1	1	0	8

secondary route are certificated to teach in grades four through eleven. This overlap in certification constitutes a built-in misplacement factor. Tables IX, X and XI are designed to show the effect of the adequacy of preparation for grade-level placements.

Grade-level misplacement in terms of teacher preparation varied from a low of twenty-four cases or fourteen per cent in the northeast geographical area to a high of twenty-one cases or twenty-one per cent in the northwest geographical area. As shown in Table IX, the average misplacement by training for a grade-level for the survey area is seventeen per cent.

Table X indicates that the level of misplacement by training for a grade-level is highest in those schools offering elementary instruction and lowest in senior high schools. The smallest schools, as shown in Table XI, misplace teachers somewhat more frequently than do larger schools.

VII. PREFERENCE FOR SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS

Table XII shows the preference levels for subject-area placements made on the basis of teaching preparation. For example, eighty-two per cent of the assignments made in the English-social studies field were highly preferred. In all subject-areas, the preference expressed by teachers is at least twenty per cent greater in the "high" preference level than in the "tolerate" level. Only thirty-three cases were found in the "dislike" preference level out of 674 cases investigated.

TABLE IX
 TRAINING AS A FACTOR IN GRADE-LEVEL PLACEMENT
 FOR FOUR GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS

Area	Possible	Grade-Level Placements			
		Trained	Per Cent	Not Trained*	Per Cent
Northwest	146	115	79	31	21
Northeast	170	146	86	24	14
Central	152	126	83	26	17
South	159	133	84	26	16
Totals	627	520	83	107	17

*NOTE: Not trained, in this table, includes teachers with junior elementary and standard elementary certificates teaching in grades seven to twelve, teachers with standard secondary certificates teaching in grades one to six, and all teachers holding letters of authority.

TABLE X
 TRAINING AS A FACTOR IN GRADE-LEVEL PLACEMENT
 FOR FIVE TYPES OF SCHOOLS

Type	Possible	Grade-Level Placements			
		Trained	Per Cent	Not Trained*	Per Cent
E	129	101	78	28	22
E-JH	97	75	77	22	23
E-JH-SH	127	107	84	20	16
JH-SH	128	104	81	24	19
SH	146	133	91	13	9
Totals	627	520	83	107	17

*NOTE: See Table IX for an explanation of this term.

TABLE XI
 TRAINING AS A FACTOR IN GRADE-LEVEL PLACEMENT
 FOR THREE SIZES OF SCHOOLS

Size	Possible	Grade-Level Placements			
		Trained	Per Cent	Not Trained*	Per Cent
Large	318	262	83	56	17
Average	183	156	85	27	15
Small	126	102	81	24	19
Totals	627	520	83	107	17

*NOTE: See Table IX for an explanation of this term.

TABLE XII
PREFERENCE FOR SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS
MADE ACCORDING TO THE TRAINING
OF THE TEACHERS

Subject Category Placements by Training	Preference Level			Total
	H	T	D	
ESS	161	29	7	197
Per Cent	82	15	3	
MSc	163	23	2	188
Per Cent	87	12	1	
FA	49	30	13	92
Per Cent	53	33	14	
Tech	59	7	1	67
Per Cent	89	10	1	
Other	84	36	10	130
Per Cent	64	28	8	
Totals	516	125	33	674

VIII. SUMMARY OF CHAPTER III

The study of teacher training as a factor in teacher placement may be summarized as follows:

1) The training of teachers for a subject-area is important in the placement of teachers in the survey area. Eight hundred nineteen subject-area placements were made on a training basis. All geographical areas use the training factor to approximately the same extent.

2) Elementary teachers, trained as secondary teachers, represent thirteen per cent of the elementary teachers' group, and secondary teachers, trained as elementary teachers, represent sixteen per cent of the secondary teachers' group.

3) Eight per cent of the teacher group is misplaced by the class of certificates they possess.

4) Forty-five per cent of the teacher group possess professional certificates. Only ten per cent of the teachers with professional certificates are found in the elementary grades.

5) Thirty-one, or five per cent, of the 627 teachers in the survey area possessed letters of authority and twelve, or thirty-six per cent of this group, were teaching at the high school level.

6) The number of misplacements in that teachers did not have the most desirable training for an assigned grade-level was 107, or seventeen per cent of the 627 cases examined. This percentage includes all teachers who hold Standard S certificates teaching elementary grades, all teachers teaching with Standard E and Junior E certificates in grades seven through twelve, and all teachers with Letters of Authority.

CHAPTER IV

TEACHING EXPERIENCE AS A FACTOR IN PLACEMENT

I. PURPOSE OF THE CHAPTER

Is teaching experience a factor in the grade-level or subject-area placement of teachers? To what extent is teaching experience used in placement practices in schools of different types and sizes? Are experience-based subject-area placements consistent with areas of teacher training or specialization? The purpose of this chapter is to answer these and similar questions.

II. TREATMENT OF THE DATA

A number of tables of data are presented in this chapter, each accompanied by a brief explanation of the significant results of the tabulations. The summary at the end of the chapter consolidates the findings from the tables.

III. SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS BY EXPERIENCE

Table XIII shows the incidence of subject-area placements of teachers on the basis of previous experience in a subject-area. Three hundred fifteen teachers, or fifty per cent of the 627 teachers questioned, were placed in one of the five selected subject-area categories on the basis of experience in that field of teaching. Subject-area placement by experience is most frequent in the English-social studies and mathematics-science teaching patterns. Total placements by

TABLE XIII
SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS ACCORDING TO EXPERIENCE
FOR FOUR GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS

Area	Major and Minor Fields of Training					Experience Placements		
	ESS	MSc	FA	Tech	Other	Actual	Out Of	Per Cent
Northwest	29	31	21	3	24	108	146	74
Northeast	29	28	16	2	20	95	170	56
Central	17	10	11	0	8	46	152	30
South	20	21	9	2	14	66	159	41
Totals	95	90	57	7	66	315	627	
Per Cent	30	29	18	2	21	50		

experience are most frequent in the northwest geographical area at seventy-four per cent and least in the central area at thirty per cent.

It is found in Table XIV that as senior grades are added the number and per cent of subject-area placements on the basis of experience decreases. The size of school does not seem to be a factor. Table XV illustrates that forty-eight per cent of such placements occurred in larger schools, fifty-two per cent in average sized schools and fifty-three per cent in small schools.

IV. GRADE-LEVEL PLACEMENTS BY EXPERIENCE

In the questionnaire teachers were asked to indicate whether a grade-level placement was appropriate to their experience. Table XVI shows the result of the responses corrected for beginning teachers who could not be included in this assessment. It was found that seventy-four, or twelve per cent of the teachers in the survey area, were inappropriately placed by experience at a grade-level. The northwest and central geographical areas misplaced teachers most frequently, or sixteen per cent of the time, and the northwest geographical area least, or four per cent of the time.

From Tables XVII and XVIII it is found that schools offering just the senior high school grades and large schools use past experiences of teachers to a greater extent when placing teachers at grade-levels than do schools of other types and sizes. Small schools and elementary-junior high schools use this factor the least.

TABLE XIV
SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS ACCORDING TO EXPERIENCE
FOR FIVE TYPES OF SCHOOLS

Type	Major and Minor Fields of Training					Experience Placements		
	ESS	MSc	FA	Tech	Other	Actual	Out Of	Per Cent
E	26	30	21	0	25	102	129	79
E-JH	27	20	20	0	18	85	97	87
E-JH-SH	20	22	10	4	17	73	127	56
JH-SH	12	12	4	0	4	32	128	25
SH	10	6	2	3	2	23	146	16
Totals	95	90	57	7	66	315	627	
Per Cent	30	29	18	2	21	50		

TABLE XV
SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS ACCORDING TO EXPERIENCE
FOR THREE SIZES OF SCHOOLS

Size	Major and Minor Fields of Training					Experience Placements		
	ESS	MSc	FA	Tech	Other	Actual	Out Of	Per Cent
Large	45	45	28	5	29	152	318	48
Average	31	27	16	1	21	96	183	52
Small	19	18	13	1	16	67	126	53
Totals	95	90	57	7	66	315	627	
Per Cent	30	29	18	2	21	50		

TABLE XVI
TEACHING EXPERIENCE AS A FACTOR IN
GRADE-LEVEL PLACEMENTS IN
FOUR GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS

Area	Possible	Grade-Level Placements					
		Experienced	Per Cent	Not Ex- perienced	Per Cent	Beginning Teachers	Per Cent
NW	146	125	86	6	4	15	10
NE	170	134	79	28	16	8	5
C	152	117	77	24	16	11	7
S	159	129	81	16	10	14	9
Totals	627	505	81	74	12	48	8

TABLE XVII
TEACHING EXPERIENCE AS A FACTOR IN GRADE-LEVEL
PLACEMENT IN FIVE TYPES OF SCHOOLS

Type	Possible	Grade-Level Placement			
		Experienced	Per Cent	Not Experienced Including Beginning Teachers	Per Cent
E	129	100	77	29	23
E-JH	97	73	75	24	25
E-JH-SH	127	105	83	22	17
JH-SH	128	103	81	25	19
SH	146	124	85	22	15
Totals	627	505	81	122	19

TABLE XVIII
TEACHING EXPERIENCE AS A FACTOR IN GRADE-LEVEL
PLACEMENT IN THREE SIZES OF SCHOOLS

Size	Possible	Experienced	Grade-Level Placement		
			Per Cent	Not Experienced Including Beginning Teachers	Per Cent
Large	318	258	81	60	19
Average	183	147	80	36	20
Small	126	100	79	26	21
Totals	627	505	81	122	19

V. EXPERIENCE-BASED PLACEMENTS AND PREFERENCE

In the questionnaire teachers were asked to indicate the reason they were placed in a particular subject-area. The choices were by training, by experience, or by the needs of the school. For each of these choices the teachers were asked to express a preference as "high", "tolerate", or "dislike" of the placement.

Table XIX shows the preference levels for subject-area placements made on an experience basis. Two hundred sixty-two teachers answered this portion of the questionnaire out of the 315 who stated they were placed in a subject-area on the basis of previous experience. Of this total, only eighteen or seven per cent of the group expressed a dislike for the subject-area. More significantly, forty-five per cent expressed only a toleration for the subject-area. Teachers are most frequently dissatisfied with placements in the fine arts and "other" teaching fields and most frequently satisfied in the mathematics-science fields. More of the English-social studies and "other" teachers who responded to this part of the questionnaire tolerate and dislike than highly prefer experience placements. In the mathematics-science and fine arts fields more teachers highly prefer than tolerate and dislike experience placements. The number of technical teaching placements by experience is too small to establish a meaningful preference picture.

TABLE XIX

PLACEMENT BY EXPERIENCE RELATED TO PREFERENCE
FOR A SUBJECT-AREA FOR THE SURVEY AREA

Experience Teaching Placements	Preference Levels			Totals
	H	T	D	
ESS	31	43	3	77
MSc	51	27	0	78
FA	21	18	7	46
Tech	2	3	0	5
Other	21	27	8	56
Totals	126	118	18	262
Per Cent	48	45	7	

VI. SUMMARY OF CHAPTER IV

The study of teaching experience as a factor in teacher placement may be summarized as follows:

1) It is established that experience is a consideration in the placement of teachers with respect to subject-areas. Three hundred fifteen placements were made on an experience basis.

2) As elementary schools increase in size so do the number of subject-area placements by experience.

3) As the grade-levels advance from elementary through senior high schools the percentage of placements by experience declines.

4) Teachers assigned teaching tasks on the basis of previous experience express a higher level of dissatisfaction with the placement in the English-social studies, fine arts, and "other" teaching areas than they do in the mathematics-science area. The number of cases in the technical teaching area is too small to indicate a true preference for a subject-area assigned on the basis of previous experience.

5) One hundred twenty-two or nineteen per cent of the teachers in the survey area were not experienced at the grade-levels to which they were assigned.

6) Very few teachers are given a technical subject-area teaching placement on experience qualifications.

7) Eight per cent of the teachers included in the survey were beginning teachers.

CHAPTER V

PLACEMENT PRACTICES ACCORDING TO THE NEEDS OF THE SCHOOL, FACTOR COMPARISONS, AND TOTAL PLACEMENT SATISFACTION

I. PURPOSE OF THE CHAPTER

Chapter III was devoted to the part training or teacher preparation had to play in the subject-area and grade-level placement of teachers. Chapter IV studied the part past teaching experiences of teachers played in placement. This chapter examines the way that needs of the school affect teacher placement in subject-areas. No provision was made in the questionnaire for determining the relationship between the needs of the school and grade-level placements.

This chapter also compares the relative importance of teacher preparation, past teaching experiences, and needs of the school as factors in teacher placement practices as well as preference levels for placements in subject-areas by these three placement factors. The total satisfaction with all aspects of teacher placements is examined.

II. TREATMENT OF THE DATA

The information required for this chapter is presented in tables. Each table is accompanied by a brief explanation of its purposes and an interpretation of the findings from the table. A summary of important points is found at the end of the chapter.

III. SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS BY NEEDS OF THE SCHOOL

One hundred ninety-three cases of subject-area placement by the needs of the school are identified in Table XX. More than one-half of the teacher placements by this factor are found in the "fine arts" and "other" teaching categories and nearly one-quarter in the English-social studies category. Schools offering only elementary grades use the "needs" factor more than other types of schools for fine arts placements. It is also shown in Table XXI that senior high schools place teachers in the mathematics-science and technical categories by this factor more frequently than other types of schools. Schools having all the grades place English-social studies teachers by this factor more frequently than other types of schools.

Table XXII demonstrates that large schools use this placement factor most frequently in the English-social studies and mathematics-science teaching categories, while average-sized schools place teachers in the fine arts and small schools in the technical and "other" categories. However, the differences are not appreciable and most of the placements by the needs of the school are made in schools that offer elementary instruction.

IV. A COMPARISON OF TOTAL SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS BY TRAINING, EXPERIENCE, AND NEEDS OF THE SCHOOL

Table XXIII uses the totals from Tables IV, page 27, XIII, page 40, and XX, page 52. Of the 1327 placements in subject-areas reported, 193 or fourteen per cent were based on the needs of the

TABLE XX
SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS BY NEEDS OF THE SCHOOL
IN FOUR GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS

Area	Teaching Subjects Categories					Totals
	ESS	MSc	FA	Tech	Other	
Northwest	11	12	14	6	15	58
Per Cent	24	32	29	43	31	
Northeast	16	11	8	2	8	45
Per Cent	36	30	16	14	17	
Central	10	9	15	5	16	55
Per Cent	22	24	31	36	33	
South	8	5	12	1	9	35
Per Cent	18	14	24	7	19	
Totals	45	37	49	14	48	193
Per Cent	23	19	26	7	25	

TABLE XXI
SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS BY NEEDS OF THE SCHOOL
IN FIVE TYPES OF SCHOOLS

Type	Teaching Subjects Categories					Totals
	ESS	MSc	FA	Tech	Other	
E	10	12	21	0	14	57
Per Cent	18	21	37	0	24	
E-JH	11	6	12	0	13	42
Per Cent	26	14	29	0	31	
E-JH-SH	14	11	10	2	14	51
Per Cent	27	22	20	4	27	
JH-SH	5	1	4	5	5	20
Per Cent	25	5	20	25	25	
SH	5	7	2	7	2	23
Per Cent	22	30	9	30	9	
Totals	45	37	49	14	48	193
Per Cent	23	19	26	7	25	

TABLE XXII
SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS BY NEEDS OF THE SCHOOL
FOR THREE SIZES OF SCHOOLS

Size	Teaching Subjects Categories					Totals
	ESS	MSc	FA	Tech	Other	
Large	25	21	23	2	24	95
Per Cent	26	22	24	2	25	
Average	13	10	16	7	12	58
Per Cent	22	17	28	12	21	
Small	7	6	10	5	12	40
Per Cent	18	15	25	12	30	
Totals	45	37	49	14	48	193
Per Cent	23	19	26	7	25	

TABLE XXIII
A COMPARISON OF TOTAL SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS
BY TRAINING, EXPERIENCE AND
NEEDS OF THE SCHOOL

Factor	Subject-Area Categories					Totals	Per Cent
	ESS	MSc	FA	Tech	Other		
Training	233	214	118	64	190	819	61
Experience	95	90	59	7	66	315	23
Needs	45	37	49	14	48	193	14
Totals	373	341	224	85	304	1327	

school, 315 or twenty-three per cent on experience qualifications, and 819 or sixty-one per cent on training qualifications. In all subject-areas it is found that a teacher's training is the most important placement factor and is utilized more than four times as often as needs of the school. Experience is found approximately one and one-half times as often as needs of the school as a placement factor.

There is little to choose between a teacher's experience and the needs of the school as factors in placement in the fine arts and little more in the "others" category. Teachers are rarely placed in technical subjects without adequate training.

V. PREFERENCE FOR SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENT BY TRAINING,

EXPERIENCE AND THE NEEDS OF THE SCHOOL COMPARED

Table XXIV shows the preference levels for subject-areas assigned on the basis of needs of the school. Table XXV uses information from Table XII, page 37, XIX, page 48, and XXIV, page 57. A total of 1129 expressions of preference for subject-area placements are recorded. This number does not balance with the total number of indicated subject-area placements in Table XXIII, page 55, due to the fact that many teachers did not specify a preference level. Teachers prefer subject-areas for which they are trained. Teachers expressed a seventy-six per cent "high" preference level for subject-area placements by training, forty-eight per cent by experience, and only sixteen per cent by needs of the school. Toleration is the reverse with nineteen, forty-five and sixty-six per cent registered for training, experience and

TABLE XXIV

TEACHER PREFERENCE FOR SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS
ACCORDING TO THE NEEDS OF THE SCHOOL

Subject Teaching Categories	Preference Levels			Totals
	High	Tolerate	Dislike	
ESS	8	30	6	44
MSc	11	23	3	37
FA	6	32	13	51
Tech	1	10	2	13
Other	5	32	11	48
Totals	31	127	35	193

TABLE XXV

A COMPARISON OF PREFERENCE FOR SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS
BY TRAINING, EXPERIENCE AND NEEDS OF THE SCHOOL

Subject Teaching Categories	Subject-Area Placement Factors									Totals
	Training			Experience			Needs			
	H	T	D	H	T	D	H	T	D	
ESS	161	29	7	31	43	3	8	30	6	318
MSc	163	23	2	51	27	0	11	23	3	303
FA	49	30	13	21	18	7	6	32	13	189
Tech	59	7	1	2	3	0	1	10	2	85
Other	84	36	10	21	27	8	5	32	11	234
Totals	516	125	33	126	118	18	31	127	35	1129
Factor Totals	674			262			193			
Per Cent	76	19	5	48	45	7	16	66	18	

needs of the school respectively. Dislike of subject-areas increases in the same order from five to seven to eighteen per cent.

VI. TOTAL TEACHER PLACEMENT SATISFACTION

A total of eighty-six teachers expressed a dislike for their subject-area teaching placements as seen in Table XXV, page 58. Tables XXVI and XXVII were compiled to show satisfaction levels for total teaching placements. There are no appreciable differences between geographical areas with ninety-two per cent of the teachers in the survey area registering satisfaction and the balance, or eight per cent, registering degrees of dissatisfaction. Only ten or two per cent of the teachers are totally dissatisfied, and this number is just under one-half of the twenty-three teachers who suggested they were going to quit teaching or transfer to another school. Two hundred forty-eight or thirty-nine per cent will be trying for re-assignment.

Table XXVII indicates that higher levels of satisfaction are found in the elementary grades. Teachers in junior and senior high school grades find more fault with their positions.

VII. SUMMARY OF CHAPTER V

The study of the needs of the school as a factor in teacher placement may be summarized as follows:

- 1) Needs of the school is the least used of the factors studied in this survey representing only fourteen per cent of the subject-area placements. Training accounted for sixty-one per cent and experience for twenty-four per cent.

TABLE XXVI
TOTAL TEACHING PLACEMENT SATISFACTION
IN FOUR GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS

Area	Number of Teachers	Satisfied	Satisfied, With Reservations	Dissatisfied Some Areas Acceptable	Dissatisfied
NW	146	88	52	5	1
	Per Cent	60	36	3	1
NE	170	98	57	13	2
	Per Cent	58	33	8	1
C	152	92	44	13	3
	Per Cent	60	29	9	2
S	159	91	55	9	4
	Per Cent	57	35	6	2
Totals	627	369	208	40	10
Per Cent		59	33	6	2

TABLE XXVII

TOTAL TEACHING ASSIGNMENT SATISFACTION
FOR FOUR GRADE DIVISIONS

Grade Division	Number of Teachers	Satisfied	Satisfied With Reservations	Dissatisfied, Some Areas Acceptable	Dissatisfied
1	119	81	33	5	0
	Per Cent	68	28	4	0
2	112	74	31	3	4
	Per Cent	66	28	3	4
3	127	68	49	9	1
	Per Cent	53	39	7	1
4	269	146	95	23	5
	Per Cent	54	35	9	2
Totals	627	369	208	40	10
Per Cent		59	33	6	2

2) The percentage of placements according to the needs of the school were highest in the fine arts and technical teaching fields.

3) Placements by needs of the school are higher in large schools except for fine arts, technical, and "other" teaching fields. The type of school does not seem to have too much effect except that as senior grades are added the percentage of placements by needs increases in the technical area and decreases in the "other" and fine arts areas.

4) There is a marked increase in the tolerate and dislike preference levels for subject-areas when placed by needs of the school over those levels for experience and training factors. Only sixteen per cent of the 193 teachers expressed a high tolerance level.

5) In spite of the low tolerance levels for subject-areas when placed by needs of the school and experience factors, only eight per cent of the 627 teachers in the survey area expressed total or some degree of dissatisfaction with their total placement.

CHAPTER VI

TEACHER PREFERENCE AS A FACTOR IN TEACHER PLACEMENT

I. PURPOSE OF THE CHAPTER

As the data recorded in the questionnaires were examined, it became apparent that preference for subject-area and grade-level placements was an important factor with teachers. The factor of preference is examined closely to assess its importance, both for grade-level and subject-area placements. Specifically the purpose of this chapter will be to answer the following questions. To what extent is personal preference a factor in teacher placement? Is there a difference in placement by preference in different geographical areas, types and sizes of schools? Does the number of years of teacher training, the class of teaching certificate, the years of service of a teacher on a school staff, or the training route followed by a teacher have any bearing on placement by preference?

Data from the questionnaires were organized and are presented in tables to assist in determining the facts relative to the foregoing questions. The findings from the tables are discussed briefly and summarized at the end of the chapter.

II. PREFERENCE IN GRADE-LEVEL PLACEMENT

Table XXVIII identifies the number of teachers in the survey area who are teaching at grade-levels other than those they prefer.

TABLE XXVIII

NON-PREFERRED GRADE-LEVEL PLACEMENTS IN
FOUR GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS

Area	Number of Teachers	Number of Non- Preferred Placements	Per Cent Misplaced
Northwest	146	19	13
Northeast	170	29	17
Central	152	21	13
South	159	31	19
Totals	627	100	16

The northeast and south geographical areas of Alberta have the largest incidence of grade-level misplacement. One hundred, or sixteen per cent of the 627 teachers who returned the questionnaire, had been placed at grade-levels other than those they prefer.

Teachers in senior high schools are less frequently misplaced by grade level than are teachers in other types of schools. It can be seen in Table XXIX that as a school spans a wider number of grades the incidence of non-preferred grade-level placement increases. In schools offering grades one to twelve the incidence of misplacement is 1.7 times as great as in senior high schools.

In small schools, the incidence of non-preferred grade-level placement is lowest. In Table XXX, fourteen per cent of the teachers in small schools are misplaced by grade-level preference as compared to average and large schools at eighteen and sixteen per cent respectively.

Certification and Non-Preferred Grade-Level Placement

In Table XXVIII, page 63, one hundred teachers in the survey area were identified as being placed at grade-levels other than those they preferred. Table XXXI illustrates that the higher the class of teaching certificate held by these teachers, the greater the chance of being misplaced. Thirty-seven per cent of the teachers misplaced by preference for grade-level held professional certificates. Misplacement in the northwest geographical area is lower than in other areas.

Schools offering senior high grades most frequently misplace teachers by preference for grade-levels. Table XXXII illustrates this

TABLE XXIX
NON-PREFERRED GRADE-LEVEL PLACEMENTS IN
FIVE TYPES OF SCHOOLS

Type	Number of Teachers	Number of Non- Preferred Placements	Per Cent Misplaced
E	129	24	19
E-JH	97	12	12
E-JH-SH	127	25	20
JH-SH	128	22	17
SH	146	17	12
Totals	627	100	16

TABLE XXX
NON-PREFERRED GRADE-LEVEL PLACEMENTS IN
THREE SIZES OF SCHOOLS

Size	Number of Teachers	Number of Non-Preferred Placements	Per Cent Misplaced
Large	318	51	16
Average	183	32	18
Small	126	17	14
Totals	627	100	16

TABLE XXXI

A COMPARISON BETWEEN CLASSES OF TEACHING CERTIFICATES
AND NON-PREFERRED GRADE-LEVEL PLACEMENTS
IN FOUR GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS

Area	Non-Preferred Grade- Level Placements	Class of Teaching Certificate				
		LA	JrE	E	S	P
Northwest	19	1	3	4	7	4
	Per Cent	5	16	21	37	21
Northeast	29	1	6	2	8	12
	Per Cent	3	21	7	28	41
Central	21	2	3	3	5	8
	Per Cent	10	14	14	24	38
South	31	5	5	5	3	13
	Per Cent	16	16	16	10	42
Totals	100	9	17	14	23	37
Per Cent		9	17	14	23	37

TABLE XXXII

A COMPARISON BETWEEN CLASSES OF TEACHING CERTIFICATES
AND NON-PREFERRED GRADE-LEVEL PLACEMENTS
IN FIVE TYPES OF SCHOOLS

Type	Non-Preferred Grade- Level Placements	Class of Teaching Certificate				
		LA	JrE	E	S	P
E	24	3	9	7	0	5
	Per Cent	12	38	29	0	21
E-JH	12	1	2	1	4	4
	Per Cent	8	17	8	33	33
E-JH-SH	25	1	4	5	6	9
	Per Cent	4	16	20	24	36
JH-SH	22	3	1	1	9	8
	Per Cent	14	5	5	41	36
SH	17	1	1	0	4	11
	Per Cent	6	6	0	24	64
Totals	100	9	17	14	23	37
Per Cent		9	17	14	23	37

point. The higher the class of teaching certificate the higher the per cent of misplacement in all except elementary schools. The larger the school, the greater the per cent of misplacement by preference for grade levels among teachers having the highest class of certificates. Table XXXIII shows an overall increase in the per cent of misplacements as the classes of certificates progress from letters of authority to professional certificates. It is noted that teachers possessing a standard elementary certificate fare better than do teachers with junior elementary certificates.

Years of Teacher Preparation and Non-Preferred Grade-Level Placement

Tables XXXIV, XXXV, and XXXVI show similar trends to those for certification. In Table XXXIV it can be seen that forty-four per cent of the teachers who may be misplaced in terms of their personal preference for a grade-level had four or more years of professional and academic training. In the south geographical area, teachers with four years of training are misplaced more frequently than in other areas. Teachers with three years of training seem to fare best in all geographical areas.

It is seen in Table XXXV that schools offering senior and junior-senior high grades typically misplace four-year trained teachers by preference for grade-levels more frequently than do schools of other types. From Table XXXVI it is found that large schools misplace teachers most frequently in terms of their grade-level preference, but small schools misplaced most frequently those teachers who have four years of training.

TABLE XXXIII

A COMPARISON BETWEEN CLASSES OF TEACHING CERTIFICATES
AND NON-PREFERRED GRADE-LEVEL PLACEMENTS
IN THREE SIZES OF SCHOOLS

Size	Non-Preferred Grade- Level Placements	Class of Teaching Certificate				
		LA	JrE	E	S	P
Large	48	4	10	6	9	19
	Per Cent	8	21	12	19	40
Average	31	4	5	6	5	11
	Per Cent	13	16	19	16	36
Small	21	1	2	2	9	7
	Per Cent	5	10	10	43	33
Totals	100	9	17	14	23	37
Per Cent		9	17	14	23	37

TABLE XXXIV
A COMPARISON BETWEEN YEARS OF TEACHER TRAINING
AND NON-PREFERRED GRADE-LEVEL PLACEMENTS
IN FOUR GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS

Area	Non-Preferred Grade- Level Placements	Years of Training			
		1	2	3	4
Northwest	19	6	6	2	5
	Per Cent	32	32	11	26
Northeast	29	5	8	3	13
	Per Cent	17	28	10	45
Central	21	3	6	2	10
	Per Cent	14	29	10	48
South	31	6	3	6	16
	Per Cent	19	10	19	52
Totals	100	20	23	13	44
Per Cent		20	23	13	44

TABLE XXXV
A COMPARISON BETWEEN YEARS OF TEACHER TRAINING
AND NON-PREFERRED GRADE-LEVEL PLACEMENTS
IN FIVE TYPES OF SCHOOLS

Type	Non-Preferred Grade- Level Placements	Years of Training			
		1	2	3	4
E	25	7	6	6	6
	Per Cent	28	24	24	24
E-JH	12	3	4	1	4
	Per Cent	25	33	8	33
E-JH-SH	25	5	9	2	9
	Per Cent	20	36	8	36
JH-SH	22	4	2	4	12
	Per Cent	18	9	18	55
SH	16	1	2	0	13
	Per Cent	6	12	0	82
Totals	100	20	23	13	44
Per Cent		20	23	13	44

TABLE XXXVI

A COMPARISON BETWEEN YEARS OF TEACHER TRAINING
AND NON-PREFERRED GRADE-LEVEL PLACEMENTS
IN THREE SIZES OF SCHOOLS

Size	Non-Preferred Grade- Level Placements	Years of Training			
		1	2	3	4
Large	45	13	8	7	19
	Per Cent	28	17	15	40
Average	30	4	8	5	13
	Per Cent	13	27	17	43
Small	23	3	7	1	12
	Per Cent	13	30	4	52
Totals	100	20	23	13	44
Per Cent		20	23	13	44

Table XXXVII illustrates the distribution of university degrees among the one hundred teachers who were misplaced by preference for their grade-level placements. Approximately one out of four of these teachers held a degree in education, and one out of four held a degree in some other field of study. There is a larger percentage of misplaced teachers with degrees in large schools and in senior-high schools than in other sizes and types of schools.

Length of Service and Training Routes as Factors in
Non-Preferred Grade-Level Placement

It might be expected that new members on a school staff are misplaced most frequently, but the opposite tends to be true as seen in Table XXXVIII. A total of forty-five, or forty-five per cent of the one hundred teachers identified in Table XXVIII, page 63, had one or two years service in their schools. Teachers who had spent more than two years on staff number fifty-five, or fifty-five per cent.

Table XXXIX shows the number of teachers prepared in the elementary and secondary route programs who were misplaced by preference for grade-levels. Forty-seven per cent of the teachers trained on the elementary route were misplaced, compared to fifty-three per cent for teachers trained on the secondary route. Large elementary schools most frequently misplace teachers trained on the elementary route, whereas large senior high schools most frequently misplace teachers trained on the secondary route.

TABLE XXXVII

THE DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS HOLDING RECOGNIZED
UNIVERSITY DEGREES, MISPLACED BY PREFERENCE
FOR GRADE-LEVELS BY GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS,
TYPES AND SIZES OF SCHOOLS

Size	Area	Non-Preferred Grade-Level Placements	Type of School				
			E	E-JH	E-JH-SH	JH-SH	SH
L	NW	*2-0	1-0	1-0			
	NE	5-1			1-0	1-0	3-1
	C	2-1		1-0	1-1		
	S	5-3	2-0		1-0	1-3	1-0
A	NW	0-0					
	NE	3-3			1-1		2-2
	C	1-1			1-1		
	S	3-4	2-0		1-1	0-3	
S	NW	1-2				1-2	
	NE	0-2			0-1		0-1
	C	4-3				1-1	3-2
	S	0-2	0-1			0-1	
Totals		26-22	5-1	2-0	6-5	4-10	9-6
Per Cents			10-2	4-0	13-10	8-20	19-13

*The first figure in any pair in this table indicates the number of teachers holding degrees in education. The second figure represents degrees in other fields of study.

TABLE XXXVIII
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NON-PREFERRED GRADE-LEVEL
PLACEMENT AND LENGTH OF SERVICE
IN A SCHOOL

Size	Type	Length of Service in a School	
		Two Years or Less	Over Two Years
Large	E	5	7
Average		4	6
Small		2	0
Large	E-JH	4	2
Average		2	1
Small		1	2
Large	E-JH-SH	3	9
Average		4	5
Small		4	0
Large	JH-SH	1	9
Average		4	2
Small		3	3
Large	SH	7	3
Average		1	3
Small		0	3
Totals		45	55
Per Cent		45	55

TABLE XXXIX

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NON-PREFERRED GRADE-LEVEL
PLACEMENT AND TEACHER TRAINING ROUTES

Size	Type	Training Routes	
		Elementary	Secondary
Large	E	10	2
Average		10	0
Small		2	0
Large	E-JH	2	4
Average		2	1
Small		2	1
Large	E-JH-SH	4	8
Average		4	5
Small		2	2
Large	JH-SH	4	6
Average		2	3
Small		2	5
Large	SH	1	8
Average		0	5
Small		0	3
Totals		47	53
Per Cent		47	53

III. PREFERENCE IN SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS

Table XL shows little difference between geographical areas in non-preferred subject-area placements. Of the total number of teachers who took part in the survey, 181 or twenty-nine per cent expressed the opinion that their subject-area placement was other than they preferred.

For the five types of schools included in the survey, it is noted in Table XLI that schools offering all the grades misplace teachers most frequently and, in fact, forty-one per cent of the teachers in such schools were misplaced if preference for subject-area is the criterion. In Table XLII it is illustrated that teachers in small schools are somewhat less frequently misplaced by preference for a subject-area. However, there is little difference in subject-area misplacement in different sizes of schools.

Certification and Non-Preferred Subject-Area Placements

In Table XL, page 79, one hundred eighty-one teachers in the survey area were identified as being assigned to teach in subject-areas other than those they preferred. Table XLIII illustrates that the higher the class of teaching certificate held by teachers, the greater the chance of being misplaced by preference for a subject-area. In the case of subject-area misplacements as in grade-level misplacements, teachers with junior elementary certificates were misplaced in subject-areas more frequently than teachers holding standard elementary certificates. Thirty-three per cent of the teachers misplaced by preference for subject-areas held professional teaching certificates.

TABLE XL
NON-PREFERRED SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS
IN FOUR GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS

Area	Number of Teachers	Non-Preferred Subject-Area Placements	Per Cent Misplaced
Northwest	146	41	28
Northeast	170	52	30
Central	152	40	26
South	159	48	30
Totals	627	181	29

TABLE XLI
NON-PREFERRED SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS
IN FIVE TYPES OF SCHOOLS

Type	Number of Teachers	Non-Preferred Subject- Area Placements	Per Cent Misplaced
E	129	44	34
E-JH	97	26	27
E-JH-SH	127	52	41
JH-SH	128	26	20
SH	146	33	24
Totals	627	181	29

TABLE XLII
NON-PREFERRED SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS
IN THREE SIZES OF SCHOOLS

Size	Number of Teachers	Non-Preferred Subject- Area Placements	Per Cent Misplaced
Large	318	95	30
Average	183	54	30
Small	126	32	25
Totals	627	181	29

TABLE XLIII

A COMPARISON BETWEEN CLASSES OF TEACHING CERTIFICATES
AND NON-PREFERRED SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS
IN FOUR GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS

Area	Non-Preferred Subject- Area Placements	Class of Teaching Certificate				
		LA	JrE	E	S	P
Northwest	41	3	8	10	10	10
	Per Cent	7	20	24	24	24
Northeast	52	2	13	8	7	22
	Per Cent	4	25	15	13	43
Central	40	2	10	7	8	13
	Per Cent	5	25	18	20	32
South	48	4	12	6	11	15
	Per Cent	8	25	12	23	32
Totals	181	11	43	31	36	60
Per Cent		6	24	17	20	33

The northeast and south geographical areas misplaced teachers most frequently, and the northeast area most frequently placed teachers with professional certificates in subject-areas other than those preferred.

The incidence of misplacement in different types of schools is compared in Table XLIV. Senior high schools most frequently misplace teachers with professional teaching certificates, while schools that have elementary grades tend to misplace teachers regardless of the class of certificate held, but most frequently for the junior elementary certificate. The larger the school the greater the tendency to misplace teachers according to preference for subject-areas for the highest classes of certificates, as shown in Table XLV.

Years of Teacher Training and Non-Preferred Subject-Area Placements

Table XLVI, XLVII, and XLVIII show trends similar to those for teacher certification and non-preferred grade-level placement. In Table XLVI it is shown that the northeast and south geographical areas tend to misplace four year trained teachers more frequently than other areas. Thirty-four per cent of the misplaced teachers had four years of training followed by twenty-nine per cent at the one year trained level.

When types of schools are considered for the same group of misplaced teachers it is found, in Table XLVII, that schools with senior high grades tend to misplace teachers with four years of training most frequently, and schools with elementary grades misplace teachers with one and two years of training most frequently when preference for subject-areas is the criterion.

TABLE XLIV
A COMPARISON BETWEEN CLASSES OF TEACHING CERTIFICATES
AND NON-PREFERRED SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS
IN FIVE TYPES OF SCHOOLS

Type	Non-Preferred Subject- Area Placements	Class of Teaching Certificate				
		LA	JrE	E	S	P
E	44	3	14	15	6	6
	Per Cent	7	32	34	14	14
E-JH	26	2	10	5	4	5
	Per Cent	8	38	19	15	19
E-JH-SH	52	3	15	10	12	12
	Per Cent	6	29	19	23	23
JH-SH	26	2	3	1	9	11
	Per Cent	8	12	4	35	42
SH	33	1	1	0	5	26
	Per Cent	3	3	0	15	79
Totals	181	11	43	31	36	60
Per Cent		6	24	17	20	33

TABLE XLV

A COMPARISON BETWEEN CLASSES OF TEACHING CERTIFICATES
AND NON-PREFERRED SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS
IN THREE SIZES OF SCHOOLS

Size	Non-Preferred Subject- Area Placements	Class of Teaching Certificate				
		LA	JrE	E	S	P
Large	95	4	21	15	24	31
	Per Cent	4	22	16	25	33
Average	54	5	13	10	4	22
	Per Cent	9	24	19	7	40
Small	32	2	9	6	8	7
	Per Cent	6	28	19	25	22
Totals	181	11	43	31	36	60
Per Cent		6	24	17	20	33

TABLE XLVI

A COMPARISON BETWEEN YEARS OF TEACHER TRAINING
AND NON-PREFERRED SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS
IN FOUR GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS

Area	Non-Preferred Subject- Area Placements	Years of Training			
		1	2	3	4
Northwest	41	13	11	8	9
	Per Cent	31	27	20	22
Northeast	52	17	9	3	23
	Per Cent	33	17	6	44
Central	40	10	13	6	11
	Per Cent	25	32	15	28
South	48	12	9	8	19
	Per Cent	25	19	17	39
Totals	181	52	42	25	62
Per Cent		29	23	14	34

TABLE XLVII
A COMPARISON BETWEEN YEARS OF TEACHER TRAINING
AND NON-PREFERRED SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS
IN FIVE TYPES OF SCHOOLS

Type	Non-Preferred Subject- Area Placements	Years of Training			
		1	2	3	4
E	44	16	13	10	5
	Per Cent	37	29	23	11
E-JH	26	12	7	4	3
	Per Cent	46	27	15	12
E-JH-SH	52	18	17	5	12
	Per Cent	35	33	10	23
JH-SH	26	5	3	5	13
	Per Cent	19	12	19	50
SH	33	1	2	1	29
	Per Cent	3	6	3	88
Totals	181	52	42	25	62
Per Cent		29	23	14	34

TABLE XLVIII

A COMPARISON BETWEEN YEARS OF TEACHER TRAINING
AND NON-PREFERRED SUBJECT-AREA PLACEMENTS
IN THREE SIZES OF SCHOOLS

Size	Non-Preferred Subject- Area Placements	Years of Training			
		1	2	3	4
Large	95	26	23	17	29
	Per Cent	27	24	18	31
Average	54	12	12	6	24
	Per Cent	22	22	11	45
Small	32	14	7	2	9
	Per Cent	44	22	6	28
Totals	181	52	42	25	62
Per Cent		29	23	14	34

Average sized schools, as illustrated in Table XLVIII, misplaced teachers with four years of training most frequently, and small schools misplaced teachers with one year of training most frequently. All schools misplace teachers with three years of training less frequently than teachers with either fewer or more years of training.

Years of Service in a School and Non-Preferred Subject-Area Placements

Table XLIX points out an anomaly. It might be expected that senior members of a staff would have preferred treatment when teaching assignments are made. Of the 181 teachers misplaced by preference for a subject-area, as identified in Table XL, page 79, 103 or fifty-seven per cent had been on the staffs of their schools for more than two years. The larger the school, the more frequent the misplacement of senior staff members. The difference between types of schools is not so evident, although elementary schools misplace a proportionately larger number of senior staff members.

Teacher Training Routes and Non-Preferred Subject-Area Placements

Table L illustrates that ninety-five out of 181, or fifty-two per cent of the teachers misplaced by preference for subject-areas, were trained on the elementary route. Of this group the large elementary schools misplaced the largest percentage of teachers. For the teachers trained on the secondary route, the large senior high schools tended to misplace teachers most frequently.

TABLE XLIX

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NON-PREFERRED SUBJECT-AREA
PLACEMENT AND LENGTH OF SERVICE
IN A SCHOOL

Size	Type	Length of Service in a School	
		Two Years or Less	Over Two Years
Large	E	7	20
Average		3	8
Small		2	3
Large	E-JH	5	4
Average		8	3
Small		2	4
Large	E-JH-SH	12	17
Average		4	8
Small		7	4
Large	JH-SH	4	9
Average		5	4
Small		4	0
Large	SH	9	8
Average		3	7
Small		2	4
Totals		78	103
Per Cent		43	57

TABLE L

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NON-PREFERRED SUBJECT-AREA
PLACEMENTS AND TEACHER TRAINING ROUTES

Size	Type	Training Route	
		Elementary	Secondary
Large	E	21	6
Average		12	0
Small		5	0
Large	E-JH	5	4
Average		6	5
Small		4	2
Large	E-JH-SH	13	16
Average		7	5
Small		8	3
Large	JH-SH	7	6
Average		4	5
Small		1	3
Large	SH	2	15
Average		0	10
Small		0	6
Totals		95	86
Per Cent		52	48

IV. COMBINED GRADE-LEVEL AND SUBJECT-AREA NON-PREFERRED PLACEMENTS

Table LI sets out the situation in the survey area respecting the overlap of grade-level and subject-area misplacements. Seventy teachers, or eleven per cent of the 627 teachers surveyed, indicated that they had been placed in grade-levels and assigned subject-areas other than those they preferred. Table LII shows the types and sizes of the schools in which these dually misplaced teachers were located. These misplaced teachers appear to be found most frequently in large schools containing senior high school grades.

V. SUMMARY OF CHAPTER VI

The study of personal preference as a factor in teacher placement may be summarized as follows:

- 1) One hundred teachers, or sixteen per cent of the 627 teachers who completed and returned the questionnaire, were placed at a grade-level other than that which they preferred.
- 2) As the school enrolment increases, so does the incidence of non-preferred grade-level placement.
- 3) Generally, as the number of grades in a school increases, so does the incidence of non-preferred grade-level placement.
- 4) The higher the class of certificate held, the higher the incidence of non-preferred grade-level placement.
- 5) The greater the number of years of training, the higher the incidence of non-preferred grade-level placement.

TABLE LI
COMBINED DUAL MISPLACEMENTS FOR THE SURVEY AREA

Area	Number Teachers	Misplacements		
		Grade-Level	Subject-Area	Both
Northwest	146	19	41	15
Northeast	170	29	52	22
Central	152	21	40	14
South	159	31	48	19
Totals	627	100	181	70
Per Cent		16	29	11

TABLE LII

A SUMMARY OF COMBINED MISPLACEMENTS BY PREFERENCE
FOR GRADE-LEVELS AND SUBJECT-AREAS
FOR THE SURVEY AREA

Type	Size	Number of Teachers	Number of Misplaced Teachers	Geographical Areas			
				NW	NE	C	S
E	L	68	7	3	1	1	2
	A	41	8	2	1	2	3
	S	20	2	0	0	1	1
E-JH	L	48	1	1	0	0	0
	A	33	2	0	2	0	0
	S	16	3	0	0	3	0
E-JH-SH	L	70	11	2	3	2	4
	A	35	7	1	4	0	2
	S	22	3	1	1	0	1
JH-SH	L	58	6	2	2	0	2
	A	35	3	0	0	0	3
	S	35	4	2	0	1	1
SH	L	74	7	0	3	4	0
	A	39	4	1	3	0	0
	S	33	2	0	2	0	0
Totals		627	70	15	22	14	19
Per Cent			11	22	31	20	27

6) The number of years on staff does not seem to be a factor in grade-level placement.

7) The route followed in preparation for teaching seems to have no relationship to the incidence of non-preferred grade-level placement.

8) Subject-area misplacement according to teacher preference is nearly twice as frequent at twenty-nine per cent as grade-level misplacement at sixteen per cent.

9) Larger schools have a higher incidence of subject-area misplacement by teacher preference than do smaller schools. This is basically true of all types of schools.

10) Senior staff members, in terms of years on a school staff, are more frequently assigned non-preferred subject-areas than are other teachers.

11) Teachers with the highest classes of certificates are more frequently placed in non-preferred subject-areas.

12) Teachers with one or four years of teacher training are misplaced four times as frequently as teachers with two or three years of training.

13) Teachers with elementary route patterns of training were misplaced in subject-area teaching positions more frequently than those teachers with secondary route patterns.

14) The results of this survey suggest that approximately eleven per cent of the teachers in Alberta Counties and School Divisions may be misplaced by preference for grade-level and subject-area placements.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

The manner of and basis for the placement of teachers in both subject-areas and grade-level positions, as shown in this study, leaves much to be desired. There appears to be little regard on the part of teachers and school administrators for establishing and maintaining placement practices consistent with the opinions of educational writers and the recommendations of research projects focusing on the problem. This chapter summarizes and examines the more significant findings of this survey and relates them to the major and minor survey problems.

II. THE TEACHER PREPARATION FACTOR

Teacher Training and Grade-Level Placements

A large number of teachers are teaching at grade-levels for which they are not trained. There are 107, or seventeen per cent of the teachers in the survey area, in this category. In all types of schools it was found that large schools most frequently misplaced teachers trained for a grade-level. Schools of the elementary type misplaced teachers on this basis most frequently, or twenty-two per cent of the total number of cases.

The training route followed by teachers equips them to teach at certain grade-levels. Without questioning the overlap in certification, and using the grade-levels prescribed by the Department of Education, two gross misplacements are found. Thirty, or thirteen per cent of the

elementary teachers, were trained on the secondary routes. Fifty-nine, or sixteen per cent of the secondary teachers, were trained on the elementary route.

A total of fifty-one, or eight per cent of the teachers in the survey area, are misplaced by grade-level for the class of certificates they hold. A total of thirty-one, or five per cent of the teachers, held Letters of Authority. Types of schools containing grades seven to twelve and one to twelve used teachers holding Letters of Authority most frequently.

Two hundred eighty-three, or forty-five per cent of the teachers in the survey area, held professional certificates, but only ten per cent of these were found in elementary schools.

Teacher Training and Subject-Area Placements

Eight hundred nineteen of the placements in subject-areas were made on the basis of training. For all types of schools, the academic subject-area fields received fifty-five per cent of the total of such placements. All types of schools received approximately the same percentage of academic teachers on the basis of being trained for the subject-area.

The grade one to twelve type of school received the largest number of teachers on a training basis.

Summary of the Teacher Training Factor

Quite clearly, a training basis is the most significant factor in the placement of teachers in all geographic areas, in all types and sizes of schools and in all teaching fields. Teachers are placed in

English-social studies teaching areas by training 2.45 times as frequently as they are placed there by experience. All other teaching fields are treated in nearly the same way except technical subject-areas. In the latter case 5.33 times as many teachers are placed by training.

When preference for a subject-area is the criterion, training is the most easily justified factor to use in placement. High preference for a subject-area varies from 2.3 to 29.5 times higher for placements by teacher preparation than for placement by experience, for the subject-area groupings used in this survey.

III. THE EXPERIENCE FACTOR

Teacher Experience and Grade-Level Placements

An examination of the data relevant to grade-level placement by experience yields the fact that seventy-four, or twelve per cent of the teachers in the survey area, are misplaced by experience. This figure excludes beginning teachers.

The placement of inexperienced teachers in geographical areas varied from four per cent in the northwest to sixteen per cent in the central and northeast areas. However, there was no significant difference by types of schools. There were more cases of the placement of inexperienced teachers in the elementary-junior high type of school than in other types. Small schools have the highest incidence of placement of inexperienced teachers.

Teacher Experience and Subject-Area Placements

Three hundred fifteen, or fifty per cent of the teachers in the survey area, were placed in subject-area teaching positions on the basis of experience. In the five major-minor fields of training investigated, it is found that the academic subjects received fifty-nine per cent of the teachers placed on an experience basis. The elementary schools received 102 of the total of 315, or thirty-one per cent of the experienced teacher placements, which is more than any other type of school. Large schools received more teachers on this basis than did other sizes, accounting for forty-eight per cent of the 315 placements by the teacher being experienced in a subject-area.

Summary of the Teaching Experience Factor

As many as twelve per cent of the teachers in the survey area have no experience at the grade-levels in which they were placed, and fifty per cent of the same group of teachers had no experience in the subject-areas in which they were placed. Elementary schools and large schools had the largest numbers of subject-area placements of inexperienced teachers, whereas elementary schools and small schools had the largest numbers of grade-level placements of inexperienced teachers.

Teachers rate subject-area placements in which they have no experience at the "tolerate" level of preference in the majority of cases except for mathematics-science and fine arts categories. In these two cases, a "high" preference is recorded more frequently.

IV. THE NEEDS OF THE SCHOOL FACTOR

Needs of the School and Subject-Area Placements

The results of this study show that, in the survey area, 193 of the reported subject-area placements were made on the basis of needs of the school. The largest per cent of these placements were made in the fine arts and "other" groupings of subject fields, together accounting for fifty-one per cent of the total.

The percentage of placements by needs of the school in fine arts drops from thirty-seven in the elementary to nine in the senior high types of schools. It must be recognized that the fine arts are not taught to any great extent in the senior grades. The reverse is true of the technical subjects. The percentage of technical subject-area placements increases from zero to thirty at the elementary and senior high types of schools respectively.

Except for the junior-senior high type of school, misplacements by reason of placement by needs of the school are most frequent in the large school.

Summary of the Needs of the School Factor

Placements by needs of the school plays an important part in school programs. Experience and training are respectively 1.6 and 4.4 times as important in a total subject-area placement sense. Needs of the school play a greater part than experience for subject-area placement in the technical subjects and nearly as important a part in the fine arts and "other" categories.

A higher percentage of the teachers dislike subject-areas when placed according to the needs of the school than when placed either by training or experience qualifications. Preference, however, is higher at the "tolerate" level. Very few teachers expressed a high preference for subject-areas assigned according to the needs of the school.

V. GENERAL PLACEMENT SATISFACTION SUMMARY

When the satisfaction level for total teaching assignment is considered in conjunction with the preference levels for placements by training, experience, and needs of the school, an apparent indifference to placement seems to be evident. Only two per cent of the teachers are dissatisfied. Six per cent are dissatisfied, but find some areas of their work acceptable.

VI. THE PREFERENCE FACTOR

Teacher Preference in Grade-Level Placements

One hundred, or sixteen per cent of the teachers in the survey, indicated they were teaching at grade-levels other than those they preferred. This represents nearly one-sixth of the survey sample. It might reasonably be expected that the one hundred teachers have the lowest classes of certificates, that they have a minimum number of years of training, that they are new members of school staffs, or that the route followed in teacher training may be a factor in their misplacement. These expectations are not supported by the findings of this survey.

The higher the class of certificate the higher the incidence of misplacement. Thirty-seven of the one hundred teachers who were placed at a grade-level other than the one they preferred held professional teaching certificates. No clear patterns of placement are found for type and size of school, except that large schools of all types account for thirty-seven out of one hundred of these misplacements. Small senior high schools place teachers by preference less frequently than other sizes.

A similar situation exists with respect to years of teacher preparation. Forty-four of the one hundred teachers with four or more years of training would have preferred a different grade-level placement. For some reason, three year trained teachers were misplaced less often than those with one and two years of training. Large schools of all types accounted for forty-seven of the misplacements. Small high schools misplace teachers with four years of training by grade-level preference more frequently than do schools of other sizes.

Fifty-five of the grade-level misplacements were teachers with more than two years of service in a school. In both the "two and under" and "over two" years categories for service, it was found that the large schools most frequently misplaced teachers by grade-level preference and accounts for fifty of the one hundred cases. Average and small sized schools followed in this order with thirty-two and eighteen misplacements respectively.

Teachers trained on the secondary route were misplaced fifty-three times compared with elementary trained teachers at forty-seven

times. For the one hundred teachers misplaced by preference for grade-levels the difference amounted to six per cent. In all types of schools, the larger the size the greater the misplacement, which accounted for forty-eight of the one hundred teachers placed at a non-preferred grade-level.

Teacher Preference in Subject-Area Placements

The results of this study indicate that 181, or twenty-nine per cent of the teachers in the survey area, would have preferred a different subject-area placement. It should be borne in mind that a misplacement in a subject-area does not mean that the whole of a teacher's placement was unsatisfactory, however.

Teachers holding professional certificates were misplaced by preference for subject-areas in thirty-three per cent of the total number of misplacements. The next larger group was the teachers holding Junior E certificates. Twenty-four per cent were in this category. Ninety-five, or fifty-two per cent of the cases, were found in large schools of all types.

Fifty-seven per cent, or 103 of the misplacements, were made for teachers with more than two years on the staff of their schools. Large schools of all types accounted for ninety-five, or fifty-two per cent, of these misplacements. Schools of all sizes containing grades one to twelve accounted for just over twenty-eight per cent of the 181 teachers.

Sixty-two, or thirty-four per cent of the 181 teachers misplaced by preference for subject-areas, had four or more years of training;

fifty-two, or twenty-nine per cent, had one year of training. Again in this consideration, ninety-five, or fifty-two per cent of the misplacements, were found in large schools of all types. The grade one to twelve type of school accounted for fifty-two, or nearly twenty-nine per cent of the 181 cases.

The secondary route trained teachers accounted for eighty-six, or forty-eight per cent of the total number of misplacements by preference for subject-areas. This is the reverse of the total number of misplacements by preference for grade-levels. Ninety-five, or fifty-two per cent of the misplacements, were found in large sized schools, although the average size elementary-junior high type of school had a higher number of non-preferred placements than the large size of the same type. Twenty-nine, or over sixteen per cent of the misplacement cases, were found in the grades one to twelve type of school.

Summary of the Teacher Preference Factor

The results of this study reveal that the incidence of misplacement by teachers' preference for grade-levels is sixteen per cent and for subject-areas is twenty-nine per cent. As indicated in Table LI on page 93, seventy, or eleven per cent of the teachers in the survey area, are misplaced both at grade-levels and in subject-areas. Large schools that contain grades one to twelve misplaced teachers by this preference criterion most frequently.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is likely that no solution can be found for faulty teacher placement practices outside or apart from other educational problems such as the selection and recruitment of adequate numbers of teachers, adequate salaries for professional teachers, adequate supervision of beginning and impressed teachers, adequate consolidation of schools for maximum size and efficiency, adequate space and facilities, adequate instructional resource materials and equipment, and adequate supervisory staff.

Sound placement practices and guidelines should be developed, and it is to this idea that the following recommendations are addressed.

1) The most important measure that can be undertaken is one of educating teachers, school administrators, superintendents, school committees and boards in the importance of sound, enlightened placement policies and procedures.

2) Each school system should adopt and write into school administration policy those concepts and principles to be used as a guide in teacher placement.

3) Innovations in the organization of schools should be investigated and modelled that will lead to more effective use of present teacher personnel.

4) Certification of teachers should be re-examined to eliminate the overlap of grade-levels and should be structured in two ways to permit employing authorities to have assurance that teachers are qualified

for specific placements. Certificates should be issued for grade-levels and for subject-areas.

5) Vigorous programs of selection and recruitment of teachers should be undertaken and these people should be provided with adequate guidance to ensure their selection of training patterns to meet the changing requirements in the teaching force.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Conant, James B. *The Education of American Teachers*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963.
- Elsbree, Willard S. and Edmund E. Reutter Jr. *Staff Personnel in the Public School*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1954.
- Goetting, Martin L. *Teaching in the Secondary School*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1954.
- Smith, Elmer R. (ed.). *Teacher Education: A Reappraisal*. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

B. PERIODICALS

- Allen, Wendell C. "Assignment and Its Relationship to Teaching Expertness," *Journal of Secondary Education*, Vol. 37, (December, 1962), pp. 473 - 77.
- Chorny, M. (ed.). "English Memos," *English Council of the Alberta Teachers' Association*, Vol. 1, No. 2, (March, 1966), p. 1.
- Eddy, Wesley P. "Teacher Characteristics and Grade IX Social Studies Achievement," *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. IX, No. 4. Edmonton: The University of Alberta, December, 1963, pp. 261 - 262.
- Fielstra, Clarence. "Subject Matter Assignments of Teachers in Smaller High Schools," *California Journal of Secondary Education*, Vol. 34, (November, 1959), pp. 420 - 25.
- Lindstedt, Sidney A. "Teacher Qualifications and Grade IX Mathematics Achievement," *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. VI, No. 2, Edmonton: The University of Alberta, June, 1960, pp. 261 - 262.
- Marshal, M., et al. "Beware the Foreign Language Bandwagon," *Elementary School Journal*, Vol. LXI, (December, 1960), pp. 133 - 136.
- McAulay, J. D. "Training and Retraining of Mathematics and Science Teachers," *Science Education*, Vol. XLIX, (March, 1965), pp. 162 - 164.

- Mitzel, Harold E. and Walter Dick. "The Relative Importance of Teacher Misassignment as a Problem for Education," *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 16, (March, 1965), pp. 54 - 60.
- Rancier, G. J. "Case Studies of High School Drop-Outs," *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. IX, No. 1, Edmonton: The University of Alberta, March, 1963, p. 20.
- Romine, Stephen. "Teaching Assignments and Instructional Loads in Secondary Schools," *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals*, Vol. 42, (November, 1958), pp. 55 - 63.
- Schultz, Raymond E. "Keeping Up Teacher Morale," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 50, (October, 1952), pp. 53 - 56.
- Tetley, Dorothy F. and M. D. Jenkinson. "Teacher Characteristics and Teacher Qualifications," *The Canadian Administrator*, Vol. IV, No. 1, Edmonton: The University of Alberta, October, 1964.
- Worth, Walter H. "What Happens to Newly Certified Teachers?" *The Alberta School Trustee*, Vol. XXXV, No. 5, (December, 1965), pp. 8 - 9.

C. PUBLICATIONS

- Alberta Teachers' Association. "Standards of Professional Conduct," *The Alberta Teachers' Association Handbook*. Edmonton: The Alberta Teachers' Association, November, 1965, p. 25.
- Alberta Teachers' Association. *Accreditation*. Problems in Education Series, No. 3. Edmonton: The Alberta Teachers' Association, November, 1960, p. 13
- Bush, Robert N. "Responsibility for Professional Performance," National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. *The Education of Teachers: Certification*. Report of the San Diego Conference. Washington, D.C.: The Commission, 1960, pp. 271 - 76.
- Faculty of Education. *Calendar*. Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1965-66.
- Faculty of Education. *Calendar*. Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1960-61.

- Clarke, S. C. T., and S. Richel. "The Effect of Class Size and Teacher Qualifications on Achievement," *The Alberta Teachers' Association Research Monograph No. 5*, Edmonton: The Alberta Teachers' Association, April, 1963, p. 71.
- Conant, James B. *Recommendations for Education in the Junior High Years, A Memorandum to School Boards*. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Services, 1960, p. 13.
- Government of the Province of Alberta. *Regulations Governing Certification of Teachers*. Edmonton: Department of Education, 1966.
- MacArthur, R. S. and Sidney A. Lindstedt. "The Alberta Teacher Force in 1957-58," *Alberta Advisory Committee on Education Research, Monograph in Education No. 3*. Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1960.
- National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. "The Assignment and Misassignment of American Teachers," *Report of the Special Committee*. Washington, D.C.: The Commission, 1965.
- Osborn, Wayland W. "The General Certificate and Enforcement of Teaching Assignments," National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, *The Education of Teachers: Certification*. Report of the San Diego Conference. Washington, D.C.: The Commission, 1960, pp. 215 - 26.
- Report of the Royal Commission on Education*. Edmonton: The Queen's Printer, 1959, p. 186.

D. MICROFILMS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATERIALS

- Chase, Francis S. *Factors Productive of Satisfaction in Teaching*. Doctoral dissertation presented to the Faculty of the Division of Social Sciences. Chicago: June, 1951, 251 leaves.
- Government of the Province of Alberta. *Report of Superintendent of Schools*. Form 313-6C. Edmonton: Department of Education, 1966.

APPENDIX A

TEACHER PLACEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

NORTHWEST
NORTHEAST
CENTRAL
SOUTH

TEACHER PLACEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Note--If any part of this questionnaire does not seem to fit your situation, or if you wish to expand your answers or just comment on a question, please insert a sheet of paper. Your comments will be appreciated and will be helpful.

1. Your sex (check): Male ____ Female ____

2. Circle ALL the grades taught in this school.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

3. Circle ALL the grades in which you teach one or more subjects.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

Note to high school teachers: Regardless of the grade registration of the pupils, subjects numbered from 10 - 19 should be recorded as grade 10, 20 - 29 as grade 11, and 30 and above as grade 12.

4. How many certified teachers are there on the staff of this school? Include resident teachers only; i.e.: do not include travelling teachers or the teachers in schools to which some pupils are sent for special subjects.

Number of teachers ____

5. How many years of teaching experience have you had?

In Alberta ____

Outside Alberta ____

Total ____

6. How many years have you been on the staff of this school? ____

7. How many years have you taught:

In Grades 1 or 2 or 3 (singly, as a group, or any combination) ____

In Grades 4 or 5 or 6 (singly, as a group, or any combination) ____

In Grades 7 or 8 or 9 (singly, as a group, or any combination) ____

In Grades 10 or 11 or 12 (singly, as a group, or any combination) _____

Other combinations (please list the combinations)

TOTAL (Should Equal No. 5) _____

8. Check the highest class of Alberta Teaching Certificate you hold and give the year you received the certificate. The grade levels stated are the usual range. If extended by permission of the Minister of Education please note the fact under "others"

			Year
Letter of Authority	Grades 1 to 9	_____	_____
Junior E	Grades 1 to 9	_____	_____
Standard E	Grades 1 to 9	_____	_____
Standard S	Grades 4 to 11	_____	_____
Professional	Grades 1 to 12	_____	_____
Others (Please write in)			

9. List any Special Certificates you hold or list the special fields for which you have special qualifications: e.g. Industrial Arts, Music, etc.
- _____

10. With how many years of training are you credited for salary purposes?

Number of years _____

11. Was your professional preparation taken in the

Elementary route? _____

Secondary route? _____

12. In what subject did you concentrate your initial preparation?
(e.g. Major--mathematics, Minor--French)

Major Area _____

Minor Area _____

13. Have you received *training* beyond your initial preparation which qualifies you in another area? If so, please list these subject-areas and grade-levels and indicate the number of courses taken in each field.

13. Subject-areas _____ No. of Courses _____

Grade-Levels _____ No. of Courses _____

14. Do you hold any degrees from recognized Universities? If so, please list them as follows:

Degree _____ University _____ Year _____

(Note: Recognized Universities would mean the degree is acceptable by the evaluations committee for years of training for salary purposes.)

15. Are you going to stay in this school next year? Yes _____ No _____

16. If you are going to stay in this school next year, are you going to:

Seek a grade-level transfer? Yes _____ No _____

Seek a subject-area transfer? Yes _____ No _____

Retain your present assignment? Yes _____ No _____

17. If you intend to move to another school next year, are you doing so:

To obtain a grade-level change? Yes _____ No _____

To obtain a subject-area change? Yes _____ No _____

For another reason? Yes _____ No _____

(Please state the reason)--

18. Are you going to leave teaching this year? Yes _____ No _____
If you are leaving, please state the reason--

19. Do you consider your *grade-level* assignment:

Appropriate for your training? Yes _____ No _____

Appropriate to your experience? Yes _____ No _____

According to your preference? Yes _____ No _____

20. If you answered "No" to any part or parts of No. 19, please describe the reasons, as you see them, for your having been assigned to this grade-level.

21. Do you consider your *subject-area* assignment:

Appropriate to your training?	Yes _____ No _____
Appropriate to your experience?	Yes _____ No _____
According to your preference?	Yes _____ No _____

22. If you answered "No" to any part or parts of No. 21, please describe the reasons, as you see them, for your having been assigned to this subject-area.

23. If you answered "No" to any part or parts of No. 19 or 21, can you explain the circumstances that placed you in the position that you could be assigned in this manner?

24. Generally how well satisfied are you with your total teaching assignment this year?

Satisfied	_____
Satisfied but with some reservations	_____
Some dissatisfaction but some areas acceptable	_____
Dissatisfied	_____

DIRECTIONS FOR QUESTIONS 25, 26, 27 and 28

Do questions 25 or 26, or 27, or 28, or any combinations of these questions that will cover the grades or subjects you teach.

Check columns 1 to 6 under the grade or grades to which you teach the subject.

Check column 1 or 2 or 3 for each subject you were assigned to teach.

Check columns 4 or 5 or 6 to indicate your preference for the subject assigned.

25. For Teachers in the Elementary Grades (Division I)

SUBJECT	ASSIGNMENT									PREFERENCE								
	COLUMN 1			COLUMN 2			COLUMN 3			COLUMN 4			COLUMN 5			COLUMN 6		
	Training			Experience			Needs			High			Tolerate			Dislike		
Gr.	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Reading	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Soc. Stud.	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Science	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Phys. Ed.	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Health	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Art	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Music	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Arith.	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Lang.	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()

26. For Teachers in the Elementary Grades (Division 2)

SUBJECT	ASSIGNMENT						PREFERENCE											
	COLUMN 1 Training			COLUMN 2 Experience			COLUMN 3 Needs			COLUMN 4 High			COLUMN 5 Tolerate			COLUMN 6 Dislike		
Gr.	4	5	6	4	5	6	4	5	6	4	5	6	4	5	6	4	5	6
Reading	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Soc.Stud.	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Science	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Phys. Ed.	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Health	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Art	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Music	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Arith.	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Lang.	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()

27. For Teachers in the Junior High School Grades

SUBJECT	ASSIGNMENT									PREFERENCE								
	COLUMN 1			COLUMN 2			COLUMN 3			COLUMN 4			COLUMN 5			COLUMN 6		
	Training			Experience			Needs			High			Tolerate			Dislike		
Gr.	7	8	9	7	8	9	7	8	9	7	8	9	7	8	9	7	8	9
Lang.	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Liter.	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Science	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Math.	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Soc.Stud.	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Phys. Ed.	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Art	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Drama	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Music	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
H.Ec./I.A.	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Oral Fr.	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()

28. For Teachers in the Senior High School Grades

SUBJECT	ASSIGNMENT						PREFERENCE											
	COLUMN 1 Training			COLUMN 2 Experience			COLUMN 3 Needs			COLUMN 4 High			COLUMN 5 Tolerate			COLUMN 6 Dislike		
Gr.	10	11	12	10	11	12	10	11	12	10	11	12	10	11	12	10	11	12
Science	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Math.	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Soc.Stud.	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
English	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Chemistry	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Physics	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Biology	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Mod.Lang.	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Fine Arts	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Phys. Ed.	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Bus. Ed.	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
Shop/H.Ec.	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()

EXPLANATION OF COLUMN HEADINGS

TRAINING means you were assigned to teach the subject because you hold a minor or a major or special courses in the subject.

EXPERIENCE means that your training for the subject is negligible or non-existent but that you were assigned on the basis that you had taught the subject before.

NEEDS means you do not have training for the subject nor do you have experience but rather that you are teaching the subject because of the needs of the school and that there is no one better qualified to do the job or that your assignment to the subject facilitated timetabling.

HIGH PREFERENCE means that this is a preferred teaching subject-area for you.

TOLERATE means in spite of no training for the subject-area (or no training or experience) you don't mind the subject assignment and feel you are doing a satisfactory job of teaching the subject.

DISLIKE means you would prefer some other subject assignment.

Many subject consolidations have been made for the high school.

ENGLISH includes language, literature and reading.

MATHEMATICS includes all such courses.

SOCIAL STUDIES includes geography and sociology.

SCIENCE includes all general science courses.

FINE ARTS includes Drama, Music and Art.

MODERN LANGUAGES includes French, Latin, German, and Ukrainian.

BUSINESS EDUCATION includes all allied business courses.

SHOP/HOME ECONOMICS includes all allied courses.

Any apparent oversight may be recorded at the bottom of this page, or on the reverse side.

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO PRINCIPALS

Ardrossan, Alberta
May 23, 1966

Dear Colleague:

I am working on my thesis for the Master of Education degree. The proposed title is, "A Survey of Teacher Placement Practices in County and Divisional Schools in Alberta".

The data will be compiled from questionnaires which take under fifteen minutes for teachers to complete. There will be no follow-up work on the part of the respondents.

Please may I count on you to distribute the enclosed questionnaires to the members of your staff. Will you encourage your teachers to complete and mail them in the stamped, self-addressed envelopes provided? Perhaps you wouldn't mind asking your staff members to give the envelopes to you for mailing?

Because the school year is getting short it was impossible for me to contact you to solicit your help. I fully appreciate that you and your staff are busy people. However, I am sure you will agree that frequently the information we require in our pursuit of further training is available only from the practitioners in the profession. The sample is carefully selected and it is therefore necessary to the success of the survey that a maximum number of questionnaires be returned to me.

If you so request, I will provide you with a summary of the major results of this survey depending, of course, on the ultimate success of my efforts. I have included an extra copy of the questionnaire for your personal use.

Thank you for your time and trouble.

Faternally yours,

APPENDIX C
LETTER TO TEACHERS

Ardrossan, Alberta
May 23, 1966.

Dear Fellow Teacher:

This questionnaire has been placed in your hands through the courtesy and cooperation of your principal.

The purpose of the questionnaire is to try to determine some of the teacher placement practices used in Alberta County and Divisional Schools. The information supplied by you will help me with the work I must do in the quest for the Master of Education degree.

You are a busy person so I have made the questionnaire basically a check type form. I am confident, from trial runs, that its completion will take less than fifteen minutes of your time.

When you have completed this questionnaire to your satisfaction, place it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope and drop it in the mail, or give it to your principal for mailing.

This questionnaire is going all over the province in a carefully planned geographically representative selection of schools. The receipt of the completed questionnaire is very important to the survey.

Thank you for your time, your interest, and your help.

Fraternally yours,

APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO PRINCIPALS

Ardrossan, Alberta
June 16th, 1966.

Dear Colleague:

Thank you very much for the assistance you and your staff have given me by completing the questionnaire I sent to you. This help is very much appreciated.

So far I have received 68% of the possible returns. I still hope to receive another 7% - 12% of the returns before June 30th, 1966. I have no way of checking the number of returns from a specific school.

I believe it is correct to say that the level of returns indicates a sincere desire on the part of the teachers of Alberta to enhance and improve the quality of education in Alberta.

Thank you for the useful and pointed comments offered by many of the respondents. The personal regards and good wishes of former colleagues and friends really gave me a "shot-in-the-arm".

Please convey my thanks to each and all members of your staff.

Yours sincerely,

APPENDIX E
ABBREVIATIONS

ABBREVIATIONS

Geographical Areas

NW - Northwest
NE - Northeast
C - Central
S - South

Types of Schools

E - Elementary
E-JH - Elementary-Junior High
E-JH-SH - Elementary-Junior High-Senior High
JH-SH - Junior High-Senior High
SH - Senior High

Teaching Subject Categories

ESS - English-Social Studies
MSc - Mathematics-Science
FA - Fine Arts
Tech - Technical

Certificates

LA - Letter of Authority
JrE - Junior Elementary
E - Standard Elementary
S - Standard Secondary
P - Professional

Preference Levels

H - High
T - Tolerate
D - Dislike

University of Alberta Library



0 1620 1066 9974

B29875